



3 1761 06891638 6













I

A

# LETTER<sup>5th</sup>

TO THE RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD,

RICHARD

LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD, 64

ON THE

TENDENCY TO ROMANISM

IMPUTED TO

DOCTRINES HELD OF OLD, AS NOW, IN THE  
ENGLISH CHURCH.

---

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE;

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

---

SECOND EDITION.

---

OXFORD:

J. H. PARKER:

J. G. & F. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1839.



BX.  
5131  
P8  
1839

“To say that in nothing they may be followed which are of the Church of Rome were violent and extreme. Some things they do in that they are men, in that they are wise men and Christian men some things, some things in that they are men misled and blinded with error. As far as they follow reason and truth, we fear not to tread the selfsame steps wherein they have gone, and be their followers. Where Rome keepeth that which is ancients and better, others whom we much more affect, leaving it for newer and changing it for worse; we had rather follow the perfections of them whom we like not, than in defects resemble those whom we love.”

HOOKE, Book V. ch. xxviii. sect. 1.

“They which measure religion by dislike of the church of Rome, think every man so much the more sound, by how much he can make the corruptions thereof to seem more large. . . . Wisdom therefore and skill is requisite to know, what parts are sound in that Church and what corrupted.

“Neither is it to all men apparent which complain of unsound parts, with what kind of unsoundness every such part is possessed. They can say, that in doctrine, in discipline, in prayers, in sacraments, the Church of Rome hath (as it hath indeed) very foul and gross corruptions; the nature whereof, notwithstanding, because they have not for the most part exact skill and knowledge to discern, they think that amiss many times which is not; and the salve of reformation they mightily call for, but where and what the sores are which need it, as they wot full little, so they think it not greatly material to search.”

HOOKE, Book IV. ch. viii. sect. 2.

1118753

A

## LETTER,

&c.

---

MY DEAR LORD,

IN ordinary times it is best and simplest to be silent amidst misrepresentations, and to commit our innocence to GOD, leaving it to Him to bring it out when to Him seems good ; “As for me, I was like a deaf man and heard not, and as one that is dumb, who doth not open his mouth ; I became even as a man that heareth not, and in whose mouth are no re-proofs : for in Thee, O Lord, have I put my trust ; “Thou shalt answer for me, O Lord my God<sup>1</sup>.” Extensive good to the many must always be purchased by the suffering of the few ; it is a portion of the Cross which our LORD has bequeathed as a precious gift to His disciples, and they must take it humbly and thankfully ; glad if they may indeed think that they have a portion of it, yet scarce venturing to decide for themselves whether it be in truth His Cross, or the chastisement of their own

<sup>1</sup> Ps. xxxviii. 13—15.

infirmities, yet taking it at all events quietly and joyously, that so, sanctified by that meritorious Cross, it may turn to their joy and consolation; and to those, to whom it is indeed His Cross, to their crown.

These, however, are not ordinary times; the waters, which stagnated during the last century, are being stirred vehemently; we trust, for the health of those who shall be cast into them; but amid the first troubling, people seem to be tossed this way and that, not knowing whither themselves shall be borne, and more curious about the fate of others, than anxious to secure their own. It is not among the least strange circumstances of the times, that tracts, written for a temporary purpose, by persons unknown, or those who were known, but little known beyond their own University, should within a few years have been made, against the will of their writers, into a sort of touchstone of opinion almost throughout the land; it is stranger yet, that the greater part of those who make these tracts a test of soundness or unsoundness of faith, should be ready to confess not even to have seen them, but have gleaned what little they know of them from the report of one or two periodicals; stranger yet, that publications devoted to politics, should at a time of great political expectation, break off their speculations, or books of gossip<sup>1</sup> “cut off their tale, to

<sup>1</sup> “Travels in Town.”

talk of" deep and sacred subjects of theology, and descant on the gifts of God in Baptism, or on the succession of Bishops; or a defence of the Establishment<sup>1</sup> be changed into an "accuser of its brethren." Amid this chaos, it is certainly *not* strange, that the wildest misconceptions should be commonly circulated and greedily received; that tales about the writers in the "Tracts for the Times" should take the place of other novelties, and that those who live to "tell or to hear some new thing," should be more interested in their novelty than their truth; or that truths which were handed down to us by our forefathers, and which in the last century, and in the beginning of the present, were held by the majority of the Clergy, should be stigmatized as novelties, because new to such as have taken their opinions from a modern school.

This ferment has already had its use; the names of individuals have been branded, but the doctrines or practices which they recommended have been at least partially received. Many who opposed them, were obliged to advance a certain way, in order to take a position from which they might with advantage attack them: still more frequently, men were thus constrained to consider subjects which they had hitherto left out of sight, but which, once brought before them, demanded an audience, and thereon found admittance, through their manifest coincidence

<sup>1</sup> "Essays on the Church," originally, and still for the most part, an useful exposure of the pseudo-voluntary system.



with the teaching or the services of our Church. Thus, many observe the Ember weeks, acknowledge in some degree the duty of fasting, keep some of the festivals of the Church, acknowledge the privileges of their Ministry, are thankful for the gifts of GOD in their Baptism, have truer views of repentance, recognize the benefits of more frequent Communion, not to speak now of a deeper knowledge of its blessedness, who perhaps little suspect from what quarter they derived their present views. Doubtless too some of those who now have "heresy" upon their lips, have been awakened from their apathy as to its dangers, ultimately, by those whom they now accuse of it; and some have derived unconsciously their value for the distinctive character of their Apostolic Church from those, whom they now too readily suppose to be alienated from, or but lukewarm towards, her. Then also these discussions, though often somewhat rudely and painfully carried on, have spread wide the seed; and so it has reached and lodged in many a heart, which GOD has prepared to receive it, and to which He has thus brought it, and is taking root, and bringing forth fruit of self-denial, self-discipline, increased devotion, and enlarged charity. We can, in another respect, already, hardly realize the state in which we were some few years ago. The plans of reforming our Liturgy, then so rife (each reformer having a scheme of his own, and agreeing with his fellows only in curtailing <sup>1</sup> the

<sup>1</sup> This, as so much besides, is inherited from the Puritans. See



whole), have shrunk away, or sunk to rest; most have discovered that one hour and an half in a week is but very little to offer to Almighty God: the murmurs against the Athanasian Creed and the imprecatory Psalms, are no longer heard: and those who retain their wishes for some alteration, are content to abandon it for the time as hopeless, and to comfort themselves, that if the Liturgy were more perfect, "the sort of idolatry now often offered to it"<sup>1</sup> would be increased, and it might be "placed not only on a level with the Bible, which indeed men often do already, but even above it." Thus the Church has gained a respite; and persons, who love her, might the more cheerfully go on with the task of studying her character, and developing it in their own practice, and inculcating it on their flocks.

And with this we should have been contented, had we ourselves, or our own character, alone been concerned. Each year is changing or modifying the opinions of numbers among those, who once regarded as novelties the truths which we have put forth in the name of our Church: many now support them, who once opposed them; and of those who have been too long trained in a different system to receive any new impressions, many yet see thus much, that there is nothing in these views inconsistent with piety; and so they are content to wait with Gamaliel, to see

Hooker's Defence of the length of the Church Service, Eccl. Pol. V. xxxii. and notes, ed. Keble.

<sup>1</sup> Essays on the Church, p. 270.

whither this thing would grow, "for if this counsel  
 "or this work be of men, it will come to nought;  
 "but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest  
 "haply ye be found to fight against God."

The case, however, is altered since your Lordship, as our diocesan, has, in the discharge of your sacred office<sup>1</sup>, pronounced upon the charges circulated against us; acquitting those among us who are parochial ministers, of any "breach of discipline," and bestowing a refreshing and paternal praise, which we gratefully acknowledge at your Lordship's hands, for our "desire to restore the discipline of the Church," our "attempts to secure a stricter attention to the Rubrical directions in the Book of Common Prayer, and to restore the due observance of the fasts and festivals of the Church:" and on other topics, although your Lordship declines entering into questions, which "might hereafter tend to controversial discussions," (since your Lordship's office is to pronounce and arbitrate, not to dispute with those over whom you are placed in the Lord) your Lordship has kindly stated that "the authors of the Tracts have not laid upon your Lordship the painful necessity of interfering, nor have you any fear that we shall ever do so." And thus, while we thankfully acknowledge the caution which your Lordship gives, especially to those who have learnt of us, (since in times of excitement

<sup>1</sup> Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford, 1838, pp. 20, 21.

there must always be reason to fear lest the truth should be evil spoken of, through the exaggerations of those who receive it,) we feel ourselves acquitted, not of human infirmity, but of having put forth any such doctrine, or in such spirit, as would call for the admonitions of those who have authority in the LORD'S vineyard.

But this acquittal by your Lordship, calculated in itself to inspire confidence in the members of the Church, and to procure us peace, has proved only contemporaneous, at least, with yet more violent and more extended censure. Even your Lordship's name and office has not been spared, simply for having acquitted us <sup>1</sup>; many seem to be perplexed, as if there must be some evil about the thing, of which there is so much evil spoken; as the chief captain commanded to examine St. Paul "with scourging, that he might know wherefore they cried so against him." Acts xxii. 24.

In reverence then to your Lordship's office, I would endeavour at least to show those who *will* see, that we were not undeserving of your Lordship's kindness; both lest your Lordship's holy office (for personally your Lordship would be unconcerned) should in the eyes of any be compromised; and in hopes of restoring in some measure that spirit of concord, which your Lordship would promote; for which we pray; and which we very sensibly need, now that

<sup>1</sup> Church of England Review, reprinted in the Times newspaper.

Romanist and Ultra-Protestant are united in an unnatural league against our Church. And in so doing, I would beg respectfully to be understood, not to claim the sanction of your Lordship's authority in behalf of all the views which I profess. In some indeed, and in those affecting the most important questions, I feel assured that I coincide with your Lordship, as having learnt them from the same Mother, the Church of England; others, upon which she has not pronounced, I would claim only to fall within the scope of your Lordship's words: "There must always be allowable points of difference in the opinions of good men; and it is only when such opinions are carried into extremes, or are mooted in a spirit which tends to schism, that the interference of those in authority in the Church is called for."

The charges brought against us are heavy; disaffection to our own Church, unfaithfulness to her teaching, a desire to bring in new doctrines, and to conform our Church more to the Church of Rome, to bring back either entire or "modified Popery."

The evidence for these charges is somewhat vague: for ultra-Protestantism has in its own nature no standard except each man's private judgment, and so its notions of Popery vary according to each man's individual views; and that becomes to every one Popish, which in solemnity of observance is greater than his own, or a doctrine, or rite of Antiquity which he holds not. Time was, when the use of the surplice, the cross in Baptism, the very use of the LORD'S



prayer in the same part of the service which it occupied in the ancient ritual, to bow at the name of our LORD, to stand during the reading of the Gospel, to administer confirmation, to "turn his face" at any time from the people<sup>1</sup>, or before service "ended, remove from the place where it was begun," and the like, were accounted Popish by those of the "extreme reformation," whose principle it was that "in nothing they may be followed which are of the Church of Rome<sup>2</sup>." Whither that principle leads, our Church has once had but too unhappy experience. But the principle, although modified, is not abandoned; it is not now Popish to bow at the name of our LORD in the Creed, but it *is* Popish to do so at any other time; the Cross in Baptism is not Popish, but for any, privately, to retrace that mark upon himself, though a practice of the early Church, is Popish<sup>3</sup>; to baptize infants is not Popish, but to hold that all infants derive benefit from Baptism is altogether Popery; to bow to the Altar where such (as in some cathedrals) is the received custom, is not Popish, but to speak of it with respect is so; the title "Altar," is not Popish in the coronation-service, because it is part of the ritual of our Church; but, (though a scriptural and primitive title) used by any private Clergyman, it is an indication of Popery<sup>4</sup>; to kneel towards the east, is not Popish in a Cathedral, or in the Ordi-

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, Eccl. Pol. V. xxx. beg.

<sup>2</sup> Hooker, E. P. V. xxviii. beg.

<sup>3</sup> Essays on the Church, p. 290. Fraser's Answer to Dr. Hook's Call to Union, p. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Essays, p. 287. Fraser, p. 21.

nation-service by a Bishop, but in a Priest (although no innovation) it is so ; again, it was not so accounted in Hooker's time, in the Church, but that has become Popish in the 19th century, which was not in the 17th; it is *not* Popish, if any one, taking one alternative offered him by his Church <sup>1</sup>, "all Priests and Deacons "are to say daily the morning and evening Prayer, "*either privately*, or openly, not being let by sickness "or some other urgent cause," shall say them by himself in his own house ; but if any one, taking the alternative *enjoined* to the Parochial Minister unless "reasonably hindered, say the same in the Parish Church or Chapel, where he ministereth," and from any cause none come "to pray with him," then to pray by himself in the Church *is* Popish, and partakes of the nature of "private masses."

Again, it implies a Papistical leaning to dislike the term "Protestant<sup>2</sup>." And yet this title, the rejection of which is to argue a leaning to Romanism, does not belong historically to our Church, but to the Lutherans, and was still used exclusively of them, in the memory of some of the younger among us ; it has no where been adopted by our Church in any formulary or document of her's ; nay, it was in 1689 altogether repudiated by the representatives of the inferior Clergy at least, the Lower house of Convocation <sup>3</sup>, who would not even

<sup>1</sup> Directions "Concerning the Service of the Church," in Preface to Common Prayer-book.

<sup>2</sup> Essays on the Church, p. 284.

<sup>3</sup> Birch's Life of Tillotson. See at length, Tracts, No. 71, p. 33.

allow of the phrase, "The Protestant religion in general, and the Church of England in particular," lest they should thereby seem in any way to identify themselves with the foreign Churches. Thus then, again, that is to be Papistical in the beginning of the 19th century, which was not at the close of the 17th; or the main body of our Clergy had then a Papistical leaning. The adoption of a Lutheran title might surely better prove those who use it, to identify themselves with the Lutherans, than its rejection to imply any lurking feeling for the Church of Rome. The title, as simply negative, is ill-fitted to characterize the faith of any portion of the Christian Church; it speaks only of what we do not hold, not of what we do hold, and is accordingly in some countries, as Italy, adopted by those who intend thereby to deny, not the errors only held by Rome, but the Faith which she has retained: "which imagine the canker "to have eaten so far into the very bones and marrow of the Church of Rome, as if it had not so "much as a sound belief, no, not concerning God "Himself, but that the very belief of the Trinity were "a part of Anti-Christian corruption<sup>1</sup>." For the most part, Protestant is there the title assumed by the infidel. And this abuse of the title lies in its very nature; it is always more real to describe ourselves by what we are, than to state merely what we are not, lest in time our faith should shrink into the mere denial of error, instead of being a confession of the truth.

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, E. P. IV. viii. 2. ed. Keble.

It is Popery again, and disaffection to our Church, to doubt whether the Pope is *the* Antichrist, even while asserting that there is much anti-Christian<sup>1</sup> in the system of Rome; that as in St. John's time there were "many Antichrists," and the mystery of iniquity had begun already to work in St. Paul's, and his descriptions were in great degree realized by the Gnostic heresies, so there is also anti-Christianism *in* the system of Rome, though Anti-christ himself be not yet revealed, nor may we yet know when or among whom he will appear.

Again, to approve of any thing in the Roman Breviary, which was not extracted thence by the reformers of our Liturgy, betrays a longing, they say, towards Rome, an argument somewhat singular in their mouths, who speak against the "idolatry of the Prayer-book,"—as if our compilers had been not only wisely governed, but infallibly directed, and so could not have overlooked any thing, which though not essential, had yet been an additional beauty or perfection, had it been retained. Why, when we have an Easter hymn, should it be Papistical to think Advent hymns, with which the Breviary abounds, had been an accession to our service, realizing as they do the coming and immediate presence of our LORD? or to term the Breviary and Missal, from which most of our own Prayer-book is taken, "precious relics of antiquity?"

My Lord, I would not be misunderstood; we do

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix, Nos. 38. 40, 41. 48. 72. and close of "Earnest Remonstrance," prefixed to Tracts, vol. iii.



not wish, we have never expressed a wish, to have any alteration in the Liturgy of our Church ; as we mistrust others in their way, so we mistrust ourselves in our own ; they think that our Church erred in retaining too much, we think that she might have retained more of what was ancient in the Breviary and the Missal, without approximating in any way to the corruptions of modern Rome : but there is this difference in our principles, that they, not accustomed to any high views of Church discipline, for the most part as soon as they have an end in view, which they think good, think also that it is good to realize it any how ; form societies, enter into combinations, prepare schemes for accomplishing it, take the initiative in it, hoping that those “ set over us in the LORD ” the Bishops of our Church, will in time fall into it. They are, what they have upbraided one of our friends for terming himself, “ Ecclesiastical agitators<sup>1</sup> ; ” only our friend meant by the name “ to rouse the Church from within to a sense of her own privileges and gifts,” they act upon it, as referring to *outward* changes, whether in her Liturgy or discipline, produced by the “ agitation ” of a portion of her members. We have been taught to know our own place in the LORD’S vineyard ; that we are “ under authority ; ” that our office is not to reform our Church, to add or to take away from her, but to obey her ; to study her character, to see how we may more and more bring out and realize her teaching and her principles. We have, further than this, said

<sup>1</sup> Froude’s Remains, t. i. p. 258.

again and again (and I refer to this, because they who blame us should at least know our principles), that whatever is done for the Church must not be done by a majority in her, that (to use the words of one of us), "Whatever is done for the Church as a whole, must be done by the Church as a whole<sup>1</sup>." More than this, the writer among us, who from his peculiar mode of expressing himself, could least be judged of by partial extracts, and so has been, perhaps, the most extensively misunderstood, sums up in this reverential way his arguments for not further shortening the Church services. It is manifest that his own heart (one may speak of him, because he is at rest) was with those ages, when "they complied with "Scripture to the letter, praised God seven times a "day, besides their morning and evening prayer." Yet he thus sums up his account of the gradual contraction of them<sup>2</sup>. "This it will be said is an argu-

<sup>1</sup> Pref. to St. Augustine's Confessions, p. ix. add. App. No. 54.

<sup>2</sup> Froude's Remains, t. ii. p. 382. Of the same kind is the passage in which, while referring to the changes in our Communion Service, through the foreign reformers, as "a judgment on the Church," he thankfully acquiesces in our present service as "crumbs from the Apostles' table." Better (if one might so expand his metaphor) in itself, to have the whole than the fragments; but better again to have the fragments than the whole, when mingled with foreign ingredients, so that there is "death in the pot," if not to individuals, yet to the Church generally; nay, better again, perhaps, for us, because more suited to us (such as we now are) to be contented with "the crumbs," having again become babes who have "need of milk not of strong meat:" and

“ment not so much for retaining the present form of the Prayer-book” [for which he had been contending] “as for resorting to what is older. To my own mind, it is an argument for something different from either, *for diffidence*. I very much doubt, whether in these days the spirit of true devotion is at all understood, and *whether an attempt to go forward or backward, may not lead our innovations to the same result*. If the blind lead the blind, shall they not both fall into the ditch?” I at least, my Lord, must own that I felt impressed and reprovèd by this deep and self-restraining feeling of a young and ardent mind, mingling self-abasement with aspirations after something higher, and acknowledging himself unworthy to “unloose” even “the shoe-latchet” of that form of worship which in our own devotions we so imperfectly realize.

The feeling of our friend in this passage, and our own, is briefly this, we must have acted up more to the theory of our Church as she is, before we attempt to alter any ritual belonging to her. We must amend ourselves before we amend any thing of her’s. When the body of our Clergy shall have acted up to her injunctions, by performing for years, day by day, her daily service, then may they be judges whether any improvements may be introduced into that service; when our service shall have become daily

so also it is implied, they are “crumbs” which we are not worthy to gather up. The expression is abasement of self, not derogation of our service, which is but too good for most of us.

instead of weekly, then may we judge whether any additions should be made to that of the LORD's day; when people, by the daily devotional use of the Psalms, shall have come to learn some portion of their depth, then they will see whether they are not in truth Christian hymns, and how much more of Christian truth they contain than the popular modern hymns, now often in use among us; when we have learnt and taught our congregations the blessedness of infant Baptism, and to be gladdened instead of wearied by seeing our little ones, one by one, made members of CHRIST, or have realized the blessings of our own engrafting into CHRIST, then may they perhaps judge of the language of the Baptismal service; when we have become alive to the importance of a true confession of the Holy Trinity, how much belongs to it, how manifold and subtle the temptations to deviate from it, have jealously observed our own inherent tendencies, and to what heresies our own frame of mind was inclined, or from which we have, perhaps, on the very road, been snatched, then may men judge fitly whether "our Church"<sup>1</sup> at this day "needeth" not, in the Athanasian Creed, "those ancient preservatives, which ages before us were so glad to use;" or rather, when our whole selves shall have been disciplined by her solemn rounds of prayers, thanksgivings, fastings, festivals, Communions, shall we be formed in her model and

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, Eccl. Pol. V. xlii. 13. ed. Keble.



so shall understand her, and may supply any thing lacking to her. Till then, our only safe course is to abide as we are, fitting ourselves to receive any enlargement of our treasures, by learning gratefully to appreciate and to use those which we have. What is good in itself might not be good to us, until we are other than we are.

It is then, my Lord, by judging of us according to their own habits of mind, and inferring that we should feel, act, and think as they would, were they in our stead, that they have come to these strange notions about us. They, with the impatience of modern habits, could not see a fancied defect, without at once casting about how *they* might remove it; they cannot understand that men should think it their duty to sit still, should not have a wish to remove it, if they could; should think that it had been better otherwise, that hereafter what they think best in the abstract, may be best for our Church; may even speak of these things in the hopes of preparing for their ultimate restoration, if it may be, in the days of our sons' sons; but meanwhile would not, if they might, restore them. I mean not in so saying to claim any superiority for ourselves over others; we are, each as we have been trained to be; the difference is in the systems, wherein we have been formed; I would only account for the mistakes which must arise, if those who act upon one set of principles are judged upon by the other. Thus, we would freely express,

as have many of the Bishops of our Church <sup>1</sup>, our conviction that the revisers of our Liturgy did unadvisedly in yielding some more explicit statements of doctrine to the suggestions of foreign reformers, whose tone of mind was different from that of our Church; yet could we adopt the words of one, with whose views probably we do not coincide; "Happy is it for the Church, that there has always been between these opposite parties" [who would reform the Prayer-book in opposite ways] "a much larger body of worshippers, who have used their book of Common Prayer with undisturbed devotion, offering thanks to GOD continually for His unspeakable gift <sup>2</sup>."

These sentiments we have often expressed<sup>3</sup>; and I may extract here a statement made in a periodical <sup>4</sup>, expressing for the most part our sentiments, and which was quoted with pleasure at the time, as a declaration of our practical views, by one <sup>5</sup>, whose valued life was devoted to the maintenance of our Church as she is, and the uniform opposer of whatever threatened her with organic change.

"If Anglo-Catholics did but understand their posi-

<sup>1</sup> Such as Bp. Overall, Abp. Sancroft, and Sharp, Bp. Hicke and Horsley. Tract No. 81. ed. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Pref. to two books of Edward VI. compared. Oxford, 1838. d. xxxv.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix, Nos. 24. 54.

<sup>4</sup> British Critic, vol. 24. p. 69.

<sup>5</sup> Rev. H. J. Rose, British Magazine, vol. xiv. p. 219, 20.

“ tion, it would be no despicable one. For ourselves,  
 “ we find enough of satisfaction in it, not to be eager  
 “ for any of those changes in the relation of Church  
 “ to State, which late political events and constitu-  
 “ tional reforms make abstractedly fitting. What  
 “ may be the duty of persons in high stations in the  
 “ Church, is another matter, or what might be the  
 “ Church’s duty if her members one and all were of  
 “ one mind and one judgment in all things, or what  
 “ may be the duty of individuals as a matter of con-  
 “ science in the event of certain contingencies; but  
 “ at this moment, we conceive that Catholic truth  
 “ will spread and flourish more satisfactorily under the  
 “ existing state of things than on any alteration which  
 “ could be devised. We feel no desire for the meet-  
 “ ing of convocation; we are not even earnest in  
 “ behalf of a repeal of the Statute of Præmunire,  
 “ though it would certainly be becoming and just.  
 “ We want changes of no kind, whether in the  
 “ Prayer Book, or Articles, or Homilies, or Govern-  
 “ ment, except anything can be shown to us in our  
 “ present state to be literally and directly sinful. We  
 “ are content to take things as we have received  
 “ them, and are quite sure that that system which  
 “ was sufficient for the expansive minds of Andrews or  
 “ Laud, has not been so circumscribed by subsequent  
 “ political events, but it will hold us pigmies, how-  
 “ ever large we grow. We may like some parts of  
 “ it less than others; we may conceive that some  
 “ parts might be more primitive, other parts more

“ finished ; but we are thankful to have, and content  
 “ to use, what has come down to us ; and even where  
 “ any thing has had an unsatisfactory origin, we will  
 “ make the best of it, and receive it into, and assimilate it to, the glorious deposit which we inherit  
 “ from the Apostles.”

But setting aside these vague suspicions, I would now proceed to lay before your Lordship, in connection with the Articles of our Church, what we (following, as we are assured, those who have been ever accounted the great lights of our Church) believe to be her doctrine, on the points whereon we are accused ; and that (wherever the case admits) in contrast with Romanism on the one hand, and Ultra-Protestantism on the other. Thus it will appear, I trust, that the “ *via media*,” along which we, with our Church, would fain tread, though distinct from the bye ways of Ultra-Protestantism, is a broad and tangible line, not verging towards, or losing itself in Romanism. Rather is it the “ old path ” of the Primitive Church, after whose model our own was reformed, and which, amid the entanglements of the modern deviations of Rome, our reformers wished, I believe, to trace out.

On the first five articles of our Church, those which relate to the Holy Trinity, happily no imputation has been cast against us ; and on these, even the Church of Rome is allowed to have transmitted faithfully the doctrine of the primitive Church. Would, my Lord, that there were no signs of unsoundness on any other side ! But whereas a traditionary faith would be



safe with regard to these essential articles, in that it would depart neither to the right nor to the left from that which the Universal Church had attested to be the Apostolic and Scriptural creed, the greater, because unsuspected, danger will beset those who profess to draw their faith, unaided, from Holy Scripture. If it overtake them not, it is because their faith is better than the principles which they profess; they are sound and orthodox, not in consequence of their principles, but in despite of their natural tendency. The natural bias of what terms itself a "Scriptural Theology" is to a naked Creed; it would cast aside all but Scriptural terms; confine itself to Scriptural phrases; reject as "scholastic distinctions" the fuller declarations, which have been committed to the Church; boasts of contenting itself with what it terms practical truths, or what it decides to be such; takes further statements, first as simply negative, then supersedes them as having been useful formerly, but not needed now<sup>1</sup>, dwells not upon them, drops them

<sup>1</sup> "The like may be said of the *Gloria Patri* and the Athanasian Creed. It was first brought into the Church to the end that men thereby should make an open profession in the Church of the Divinity of the Son of God against the detestable opinion of Arius and his disciples, wherewith at that time marvellously swarmed almost the whole of Christendom. Now that it has pleased the Lord to quench that fire, there is no such cause why these things should be in the Church, at the least why that *Gloria Patri* should be so often repeated."—Cartwright ap. Hooker, E. P. V. xlii. 1. ed. Keble, and Hooker's answer, especially § 11 sqq.

from its Creed, takes an attitude of hostility against them, generalizes its faith; and then, since the mind must think one way or other, whenever subjects are brought before it in detail, falls an easy prey to the heresies, from which the Church would have rescued them. All true Theology must of necessity be Scriptural; but that which terms itself a "Scriptural Theology," has always been a stepping-stone to Socinianism or Rationalism. It begins in an ungrateful spirit, setting at nought the teaching of the Church, and "leaning upon its own understanding;" and it ends in being left to its own understanding, and being "given over to an undistinguishing mind." Such has been the case with every Protestant body, except those *connected with* our own Church, though not *of* it; such is the course which America, as far as it is not Anglican or Romanist, is now taking; and no one can observe the way in which unsound <sup>1</sup> American publications are creeping into this country, by whom introduced, with what apologies in one instance, for Socinianism; without being convinced that the Ultra-Protestant sects in this country, so far as they do not return to the Church or relapse into Romanism, will take the same course. Those in our Church, who have fraternized with them, are upheld by a traditional instruction, of which they are unaware, in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds; and while they de-

<sup>1</sup> See Tracts for the Times, Vol. iii. No. 73. "On the introduction of rationalistic principles into religion."

claim against tradition, are probably upheld by tradition against heresies which destroy the soul. And so, we trust, they will continue; but though there is all hope that they will be protected against the grosser forms of heresy, the subtler form of Sabellianism creeps over the mind almost unperceived; and the objections against the title *θεοτόκος*, with which we have been assailed, imply that some have sadly forgotten, what was the origin of the Nestorian heresy<sup>1</sup>.

This instance may illustrate the danger of an over-anxiety to recede from Rome, or of sacrificing truths which that corrupt Church has abused; it would lead to too long and involved a discussion to point out, article by article, wherein we, with our Church, differ from that of Rome; I will therefore trespass no longer upon your Lordship's time than the occasion requires, and will confine myself to those articles upon which we have been rumoured to approach nearer to Rome, than the limits of our Church allow. In so doing, I must make many statements, which to your Lordship are trite and familiar; but my object is to lay before your Lordship an explicit confes-

<sup>1</sup> "The Christian Knowledge Society has latterly erased from one of its publications the phrase, 'The mother of God,' rightly judging it to be Popish. The British Critic demands its reinstatement, observing, 'As to styling the Blessed Virgin *the mother of God*, did the Essex ministers ever chance to hear of the council of Ephesus?"—Essays on the Church, p. 288; also p. 304. Yet the State, by advice of our Church, acknowledged that what the Council of Ephesus "ordered, judged, or determined to be heresy," is such, 1 Eliz. 1. 36.

sion, not to say anything new upon subjects so often handled.

Art. VI. and XX.—*On the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation; and Of the authority of the Church.*

These two articles must necessarily be taken together, in order to understand fully the meaning of our Church, on the relation of the authority of the Church to that of Holy Scripture. In the first she declares that “Holy Scripture *contains* all things *necessary to salvation*, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be *required* of any man to be believed as an article of the Faith; or be thought requisite or *necessary to salvation*.” The article is manifestly directed against the Church of Rome, which has made new articles of *faith*, and so does “*require* to be believed as *necessary to salvation*,” things which are not contained in Holy Scripture. But the article, though it states, that Holy Scripture “*contains* all things necessary to salvation,” does not say that it *teaches* them in such wise, that every one may collect them thence for himself: nor does it even say, that things may not be believed or practised, which are not contained in Holy Scripture (so that of course, they be not contrary to it); but only that they must not be “*required* to be believed as *necessary to salvation*.” It is remarkable that this limitation, which is so singularly



overlooked<sup>1</sup> by those who employ this article against the right use of tradition, occurs, wherever the sufficiency of Holy Scripture is mentioned; so that the compilers of this article must have just meant to exclude the case to which people now so carelessly apply it, of “things, *not* necessary to salvation.” Thus, again, in the engagement required at Ordination and Consecration, this limitation is inserted in each clause; “Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all Doctrine *required of necessity for eternal salvation* through faith in Christ Jesus? and are you determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach *nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation*, but that which you shall be persuaded, may be concluded and proved by Holy Scripture<sup>2</sup>?” The very word also, “required,” shows that the Church had in view some one in authority who had the power to “require.” In the preceding articles our Church had embodied the doctrines of the Creeds, which, and which only are Articles of Faith, or “necessary to be believed in order to salvation.” Those

<sup>1</sup> Thus, one argues that the Apostolical succession is against our Articles, because it cannot be proved by Scripture, and by that Article nothing is to be held [omitting “as necessary to salvation”] which cannot be so proved. There seems to be the same sort of confusion in “Dr. Hook’s Call to Union, answered,” p. 9. though the instances given are mostly Popish corruptions, and so against “tradition” also.

<sup>2</sup> See further Mr. Keble’s Postscript to 3rd ed. of the Sermon, entitled “Primitive tradition recognized in Holy Scripture.” p. 12. sqq.

which follow, are Articles of Religion, which she did not receive from the ancient Church, but which she framed herself, not as essential to Communion (for this she requires only the belief in the Articles of the Apostles' Creed) but "for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion." Accordingly, at the very outset of this new range of Articles, she draws limits to her own powers and to those of the Church Universal. She does not, like the Church of Rome, increase the Creed, which no particular Church has the right to do; and she lays down within what limits the Creed may be enlarged by the Church Universal; namely, only as to whatsoever is "read in Holy Scripture, or may be proved thereby." She lays down that Holy Scripture is the sole *source* of "all things necessary to salvation;" and that nothing must be "required to be believed as necessary to salvation," but what is drawn from that source; but both at the beginning and the end she restrains what she says, to "things necessary to salvation." So then it is *probable* that our Church means that things may be *required* to be believed, (provided it be not upon peril of salvation,) which are not proved by Holy Scripture: but *certain*, that according to her, things not in Holy Scripture may be subjects of belief; and that there is a power, somewhere residing, which may "*require*" to be "believed as necessary to salvation," whatever *can* be proved by Holy Scripture. For the limitation were absurd, that things not provable by Holy Scripture, must *not* be required to be

believed "*as necessary to salvation*," unless those which can be so proved, might be required. This very article then, in laying down the "sufficiency of Holy Scripture as the *source* of all saving truth," at the same time recognizes the existence of an authority which may "require to be believed as essential to salvation," what it "can prove thereby." And this authority, in the 20th Article she declares, as in the 6th she implies it, to be the Church; for in the 20th Article, there recurs the same language, that, "as it must not decree any thing contrary to Holy Writ, so besides the same, ought it not to *enforce* any thing to be believed *for necessity of salvation*." Within this same limit, however, drawn equally by the 6th, and 20th Articles, the 20th Article expressly states, what the 6th implies; "The Church has authority in controversies of Faith." The Church is subject to Holy Scripture, but set over individuals; she may not (1) "expound one place of Holy Scripture that it be repugnant to another," nor may she (2) "decree any thing *against* Holy Writ," nor may she (3) "*besides* the same, enforce any thing to be believed *for necessity of salvation*;" but then the very fixing of these limits of her power, shows that she has power within these limits; that she is the "expositor of Holy Writ," provided she do "not expound one place that it be repugnant to another;" she may "decree things," provided they be not "against Holy Writ;" she may "enforce things to be believed" even "*for necessity of salvation*," provided they be

neither “against, nor besides, Holy Scripture.” But the power of “expounding,” “decreeing,” “ordaining,” implies that her children are to receive her expositions, and obey her decrees, and accept her authority in controversies of faith: and the appeal lies not to their “private judgment;” they are not the arbiters, whether she pronounce rightly or no; for what sort of decree or authority were that, of which every one were first to judge, and then if his judgment coincided with the law, to obey? who would not see the absurdity of this in matters of human judgment? “If thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge.” Jas. iv. 11. “If I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear?” Mal. i. 6.

But our Church in this article further and accurately defines the nature of her authority; the Church is a “keeper and witness of Holy Writ;” she is its guardian; it is from her that we know of what books the Canon of Scripture consists: she is the “witness” to the truths which it contains; not a “judge” over it, not having to determine new truth, or erect new articles of faith; but a witness to the doctrine which she herself received in continued succession from the primitive Church, as being contained in Holy Scripture.

In brief, then, my Lord, the meaning of our Church (as we conceive) in these Articles is, that the Scripture is the sole authoritative source of the Faith, *i. e.* of “things to be believed in order to salvation;”



the Church is the medium through which that knowledge is conveyed to individuals ; she, under her responsibility to God, and in subjection to His Scripture, and with the guidance of His Spirit, testifies to her children, what truths are necessary to be believed in order to salvation ; expounds Scripture to them ; determines, when controversies arise ; and this, not in the character of a judge, but as a “witness” to what she herself received.

And in this view of the meaning of our Church, we are further confirmed by the Canon of the Convocation of 1571, to which we have of late often had occasion to appeal ; the same Convocation which enforced subscription to the Articles.

“They [preachers] shall in the first place be careful “never to teach any thing from the pulpit to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what “is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New “Testament, and *collected out of that very Doctrine by “the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops.”*

So have we ever wished to teach, “what is “agreeable to the Doctrine of the Old or New “Testament,” and as the test of its being thus agreeable, we would take, not our own private and individual judgments, but that of the Universal Church, as attested by the “Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops.”

This, my Lord, were perhaps sufficient ; nor need we, we conceive, go into the private opinions of those engaged in our Reformation ; seeing that they, in many

points, varied from each other, and some of them on some points from themselves: and we have the injunction to take the Articles in their plain grammatical sense. Nor indeed have we our Articles from them; but Articles, in which their opinions have been in some respects modified; we have not the 42 Articles of Edward VI., but the 39 of Q. Elizabeth; and these have their authority to us from the agreement of our Church in 1562 and 1571. We are then in no respects even guided to look to the private opinions of any instruments of the Reformation, as interpreters of the Articles: since we are expressly referred, not to them, but to the "literal and grammatical sense"<sup>1</sup> of the Articles themselves. But we could go further; and show that they who are of most note among them, wished to submit their own judgments to that of Antiquity, and at all events, *desired* to hold no other doctrine, than that which had been received by the Primitive Church. They did not appeal to her, as has been recently said, as an *argumentum ad hominem*, merely to refute an adversary with his own weapons<sup>2</sup>. Their very language shows that they were in earnest, and speak with reverence. Abp. Cranmer, for instance, appeals, at a solemn moment, to them, and confesses<sup>3</sup> "in *all* my doctrine and preaching, both of

<sup>1</sup> K. James's declaration prefixed to the Articles.

<sup>2</sup> *e. g.* "Dr. Hook's Call to Union answered," p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Works, vol. iv. pp. 126, 7. See further and other authorities in Mr. Manning's Appendix to a Sermon on the Rule of Faith, p. 6. sqq.

“ the Sacraments, and of other my doctrine, *whatsoever*  
 “ *it be*, not only I mean and judge, as the Catholic  
 “ Church and the most holy Fathers of old meant and  
 “ judged, but also, I would gladly use the same words  
 “ that they used, and not use any other words ; but  
 “ to set my hand to all and singular their speeches,  
 “ phrases, ways and forms of speech, which they do  
 “ use in their treatises upon the Sacraments, and to  
 “ keep still their interpretation.”

And hence our Divines fearlessly appeal to the whole period when the Church was one, and spake one language, and could speak as one ; as Bishop Jewell in his celebrated challenge <sup>1</sup> : “ I said, perhaps  
 “ boldly, as it might then seem to some men, but as  
 “ I myself and the learned of our adversaries themselves do well know, sincerely and truly, that none  
 “ of them all, that this day stand against us, are able  
 “ or shall ever be able to prove against us any one of  
 “ all those points, either by the Scriptures, or by  
 “ example of the primitive Church, or by the old  
 “ Doctors, or by the ancient general Councils.—

“ The words that I then spake, as near as I can  
 “ call them to mind, were these : If any learned man  
 “ of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men  
 “ that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient  
 “ sentence out of any old Catholic Doctor, or Father,

<sup>1</sup> Sermon preached at Paul's Cross, (Works, pp. 57, 58.) extracted more at length in Tracts for the Times, No. 78. “ Testimony of writers in the latter English Church to the duty of maintaining *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est.*”

“ or out of any old general Council, or out of the  
 “ Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of  
 “ the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly  
 “ and plainly proved, that there was any private mass  
 “ in the whole world at that time, for the space of  
 “ six hundred years after Christ; or that there was  
 “ then any communion ministered unto the people  
 “ under one kind; or that the people had their  
 “ common prayers then in a strange tongue, that  
 “ they understood not: or that the Bishop of Rome  
 “ was then called an universal Bishop, or the head  
 “ of the universal Church, &c.; if any man alive were  
 “ able to prove any of these articles, by any one clear  
 “ or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures  
 “ or of the old Doctors, or of any old general Council,  
 “ or by any example of the primitive Church: I  
 “ promised then that I would give over and subscribe  
 “ unto him.” . . . .

“ Besides all that I have said already, I will say  
 “ further, and yet nothing so much as might be said.  
 “ If any one of all our adversaries be able clearly  
 “ and plainly to prove, by such authority of the  
 “ Scriptures, the old Doctors and Councils, as I said  
 “ before, that it was then lawful for the Priest to  
 “ pronounce the words of consecration closely and in  
 “ silence to himself, &c. &c.—if any one of all our  
 “ adversaries be able to vouch any one of all these  
 “ articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scrip-  
 “ tures, Doctors, or Councils, as I have required, as  
 “ I said before, so say I now again, I am content to



“ yield unto him and to subscribe. But I am well assured that they shall never be able truly to allege one sentence. And because I know it, therefore I speak it lest ye haply should be deceived.”

Nor do we in this, nor did they, approximate to Romanism ; but rather they herein took the strongest and the only unassailable position against it. Rome and ourselves have alike appealed to the authority of “ the Church ;” but, in the mouth of a Romanist the Church means, so much of the Church as is in communion with herself, in other words, it means herself: with us, it means the Universal Church, to which Rome, as a particular Church, is subject, and ought to yield obedience. With Rome, it matters not whether the decision be of the Apostolic times, or of yesterday ; whether against the teaching of the early Church, or with it ; whether the whole Church universal throughout the world agree in it, or only a section, which holds communion with herself: she, as well as Calvin, makes much of the authority of the Fathers, when she thinks that they make for her; but she, equally with the founder of the Ultra-Protestants, sets at nought their authority, so soon as they tell against her: she unscrupulously sets aside the judgment of all the Ancient Doctors of the Church, unhesitatingly dismisses the necessity of agreement even of the whole Church at this day, and proudly taking to herself the exclusive title of Catholic, sits alone a Queen in the midst of the earth, and dispenses her decrees from herself. No,



my Lord ! they ill understand the character of Rome, or their own strength, who think that she would really commit herself, as Cranmer did, to Christian Antiquity, or who would not gladly bring her to that test ! What need has she of Antiquity, who is herself infallible, except to allure mankind to believe her so ? “ I, for my part,” says one of no mean note among them <sup>1</sup>, “ to speak candidly, would rather credit “ one Pope, in matters touching the mysteries of the “ Faith, than a thousand Augustines, Jeromes, or “ Gregories. For I believe and know that the sovereign Pontiff cannot err in things, which belong to “ the Faith, because the Church’s power of determining what relates to the Faith, resides in the Pontiff. “ So then the error of the Pontiff would be the “ error of the Universal Church. But the Universal “ Church cannot err. Tell me not of a Council,” &c.

This is the very complaint, which our Divines always brought against her controversialists. Thus Bp. Jewell <sup>2</sup>: “ But one thing specially much misliketh M. Harding above all the rest ; that, the “ better to disclose the deformities and weakness of “ his doctrine, I have alleged so many Canonists “ and school Doctors. For all those he weigheth no “ better now than Esop’s fables. And therefore he “ saith, ‘ As for the gew-gaws of the schoolmen and

<sup>1</sup> Corn. Mussus, Bp. of Bitonto, quoted by Mr. Newman, *Romanism and popular Protestantism*, Lect. 2. “on Romanism as neglectful of Antiquity,” p. 98.

<sup>2</sup> Preface to *Defence of the Apology*.

“ canonists, I despise them utterly.’ Are all the  
 “ school-doctors and canonists now become *intesta-*  
 “ *biles*, *i. e.* so far out of credit, so infamous and so  
 “ vile, that they may not be allowed to bear witness?  
 “ Whose then are they? Are they not all M.  
 “ Harding’s own doctors? Is he now ashamed of his  
 “ own?—And yet will he suddenly condemn them  
 “ all, every one, by one sentence, Abbots, Bishops,  
 “ Archbishops, Decrees, Decretals, Cardinals, Saints,  
 “ and Popes and all together! But we must  
 “ pardon M. Harding; he dealeth indifferently  
 “ and is nothing partial. For even with the like  
 “ reverence he useth all the ancient Doctors of  
 “ the Church, and others of later time, that fight  
 “ on his side, and are allied to him. ‘Tertullian,’  
 “ he saith, ‘was an heretic, and wrote this or that  
 “ in defence of his heresy.’ ‘St. Cyprian,’ he saith,  
 “ ‘had an ill cause, and defended a falsehood, and  
 “ was driven to the very same shifts whereunto all  
 “ hereticks are driven.’ ‘It seemeth,’ saith he, ‘St.  
 “ Jerome was deceived by a rumour,’ &c. &c. Thus,  
 “ we see, M. Harding has a commission to control  
 “ all manner of Doctors whatsoever, Greeks, Latins,  
 “ Old, New, his own and others, if they come not  
 “ readily to his purpose. Nicolaus Cusanus<sup>1</sup> saith,  
 “ ‘Pope Eugenius tells us this thing is true, if he  
 “ will have it true, and not otherwise.’”

The Anglican Divines, then, whom we follow as the

<sup>1</sup> De Concordan. l. ii. c. 20.

expositors of the meaning of our Church, differ from Rome in the following points. *They* appeal to the authority of the Universal Church as long as it was one; Rome to the Church, ancient or modern, in communion with herself: *they*, to the *consent* of the Early Church, however it be ascertained; Rome, to the decision of Councils confirmed by the Bishop of Rome: *they* rest on it as bearing testimony to an Apostolic origin: Rome, as the result of her own infallibility: *they* hold that the Universal Church is only a witness to the Catholic truth, and has no power of forming new articles of faith; Rome, that even the Modern Church in communion with herself, has that power: *they*, that the Church is a witness; Rome, that she is a judge: *they*, that the more recent may not contradict the ancient; Rome, that she may, and may correct them: *they*, that the meaning of Holy Scripture, of which the Church is the interpreter, must always be one and the same, to be collected from "the agreement of the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops;" Rome, that the Church may, under different circumstances, affix different meanings, and that the meaning last affixed supersedes the former<sup>1</sup>: *they*, in a word, seek for a

<sup>1</sup> See the remarkable extract from Card. Cusa in Mr. Newman's Romanism, &c. Lect. 2, "on Romanism as neglectful of Antiquity," p. 97, *note*. Here a few sentences may be extracted; his task is to defend the Council of Constance for refusing the cup to the laity, contrary to our Lord's institution and the practice of antiquity, as itself acknowledged. "Let it not disturb thee, that "at different times, the rites of sacrifices and even of sacraments

genuine Apostolic tradition, to be established by the consent of all times, all Churches, and the great Doctors of all those Churches; Rome (like Ultra-Protestants,) follows modern traditions, assumes them to be Apostolic, simply because she holds them, and she is infallible; and so was the ancient Church, in communion with Rome; and so she must have taught then the same as Rome does now. And thus she brings in her modern corruptions, against which the appeal to Christian Antiquity is the surest safeguard. Scriptural language she can (as did the enemy of mankind to whom she is partially in bondage,) plausibly apply: many of her chief corruptions, she (in common with Ultra-Protestants) rests on the language of Scripture, and (in common also with them) in contradiction to the ancient Church; but the appeal to Antiquity she cannot elude. It is too full, too

“are found to differ, the truth abiding the same; and that  
 “Scriptures are *adapted to the times, and variously understood,*  
 “being explained at one time in conformity to the rite then  
 “universally prevalent, and again their meaning being changed  
 “when the rite is changed. For Christ, to whom the Father hath  
 “delivered the kingdom of heaven and earth, in both uses a sort of  
 “economy, and either *by secret inspiration, or by a clearer explanation,*  
 “*suggests what suits each distinct period.* Wherefore if  
 “the Church’s interpretation of the *same Gospel precept be different now from heretofore, yet this sense now current in the*  
 “*Church, being inspired for the use of the Church, as being suited*  
 “*for the times, is to be accepted as the way of salvation. It is*  
 “*therefore an absurd argument, to try to object to an universal*  
 “*rite of the [Roman] Church out of the writings of their predecessors.*”



circumstantial. No, my Lord, they only who suspect Antiquity, because it is opposed to modern and private doctrines of their own, need fear committing themselves and their Church to it; we have full confidence in our Church, and know that she can stand the test of primitive doctrine, and that Rome cannot. Rome may entice the unwary by the name of Antiquity, but she dare not pledge herself to the reality: if in name she seem to take the same ground as the Anglican Divines, she *must* differ from them. Or to look upon it in another way; Rome differs from us, *as to the authority* which she ascribes to tradition; she regards it as *coordinate*, our divines as *subordinate*: *as to the way in which it is to be employed*; she, as independent of Holy Scripture, our's, as subservient to, and blended with, it; *as to its limits*, she supposes that the Church of Rome has a power of imposing new articles, necessary to be believed for salvation; our's, that all such articles were comprised at first in the Creed, and that the Church has only the power of clearing, defining, and expounding these fixed articles: *as to the office of the Church therein*; Rome supposes that the Church may select of different opinions that which she judges right; our's, that she must take that which is attested by universal consent: *as to the power of the Church*; Rome supposes that the Church may stamp that as certain, which before was really uncertain; our's, that she only ascertains that to be certain which in fact was so, but had not formally been pronounced to be so:



*as to the source of that power* ; Rome places it in her own assumed infallibility ; our's, in the office of the Church, as the depository of, and witness to, the traditions confided to her : so then, beyond the name of tradition, the Church of Rome and our Divines differ in every thing besides.

It might yet be satisfactory to state two or three points bearing upon this subject :—

1st, (lest the name of tradition should appear to imply an indefinite body of truth,) as to the *subjects* comprehended in the traditions acknowledged by the Church. These, as drawn out by the learned Dean Field<sup>1</sup>, are (1) the number and names of the authors of books divine and canonical, (2) that summary of the chief heads of Christian doctrine contained in the Apostles' Creed, (3) “The form of Christian doctrine and explication of the several parts thereof, which the first Christians, receiving of the same Apostles that delivered to them the Scriptures, commended to posterities.” [Whence it was enabled to expand the Apostles' Creed into the Nicene and Athanasian.] (4) “Rites not expressly contained in Scripture, though the grounds, reasons, or causes of their necessity, or benefit are ; as Infant Baptism.” (5) The particular application of things generally ordained ; “of this sort, many think, the observation of the Lenten fast, the fast of the fourth and sixth days of the week, and

<sup>1</sup> Of the Church, p. 375, extracted more fully in the Catena above quoted, p. 12—15.

“ some others.” Or, as Bp. Beveridge <sup>1</sup> states them, somewhat less rigidly. (1) The inspiration of Holy Scripture. (2) Things “ which, although they are “ not read in express and definite terms in the Holy “ Scriptures, are yet *by the common consent of all “ Christians* drawn out of these Scriptures (as the “ articles of the Creed). These and such like, al- “ though they are not, either in the Old or New “ Testament, declared in so many words or syllables, “ yet have they, as founded on both, ever been agreed “ on by all Christians, certain few heretics only “ excepted, of whom no more account is to be had “ in religion, than of monsters in nature.” (3) Ob- servances, “ no where enjoined in Holy Scripture “ directly and by name, yet have they, during 1400 “ years from the Apostles, been every where received “ into public use of the Church ; nor can there be “ found any Church during that period not agreeing “ thereto. So that there have been, as it were, “ certain *common notions* from the beginning im- “ planted in the minds of all Christians, not so much “ from any particular passages of Holy Scripture, as “ from all ; from the general scope and tenor of the “ whole Gospel ; from the very nature and purpose “ of the religion therein established ; and, finally “ from the constant tradition of the Apostles, who

<sup>1</sup> Preface to Codex Canonum Eccl. Prim. vindicatus et illustr. translated at length, ib. p. 65 sqq. ; and prefixed to the translation of the valuable Commonitory of Vincentius recently published at Oxford.

“ together with the faith, propagated ecclesiastical  
 “ rites of this sort, and if I may so speak, general  
 “ interpretations of the Gospel. For on any other  
 “ supposition it would be incredible, or even impos-  
 “ sible, that they should have been received with so  
 “ unanimous a consent every where, always, and by  
 “ all.” In the second class of Bp. Beveridge may be  
 included (4) interpretations of specific passages of  
 Holy Scripture, upon which there is universal agree-  
 ment in the ancient Church.

(2) *As to the power of the existing Church*; The  
 right of the existing Church is limited not by any  
 arbitrary line, but by facts. (1) As to matters ne-  
 cessary to salvation the whole testimony of the  
 Church has been given, so that her office thus far of  
 necessity has ceased<sup>1</sup>. The Creeds have received their  
 completion, unless indeed some new heresy on its  
 Articles could arise, in which case the whole Church,  
 could it be assembled, might give witness against it.  
 (2) In cases not so fixed, her tradition has in many  
 cases been broken, so that she could no longer rest  
 her decision upon her present testimony, but must  
 collect it from those ages in which it was yet un-  
 broken. And hence it is, not from any abstract ideal  
 of the first ages, that our Divines appeal to the Church,  
 “ anterior to the division of the East and West.”

<sup>1</sup> Hence the Council of Ephesus forbade any additional Creed,  
 beside that of Nice, being “ presented to those converted from  
 Heathenism, Judaism, or any heresy.” This is contravened by  
 Rome in the formation of Pope Pius’ Creed. See Perceval on the  
 Roman Schism, p. 33.

(3) The “Indefectibility of the Church” is very different from the “Infallibility” assumed by Rome. We believe that (although Councils, which have been termed “General,” or which Rome has claimed to be so, have erred,) no real Œcumenical Council ever did; *i. e.* no Council really representing the Universal Church. Our Church of old formally accepted the six Œcumenical Councils<sup>1</sup>; our great Divines, who may be looked upon as speaking her voice, appeal, generally, to the period comprehending these six Councils<sup>2</sup>, as that which has authority in matters of faith. And this they do, because the Church was then one, and it was to His one Church, and as being one, that our LORD’s promise was made<sup>3</sup>. And now, on that ground, her functions are, in this respect, suspended; she cannot meet, as one; and this coincidence of the errors of these later days, and the interruption of her harmony, seem remarkably to illustrate this fulfilment of our LORD’s promise: particular Churches have fallen into error, because the Church has separated, and the Church is prevented

<sup>1</sup> In the Council of Calchuythe, A.D. 785 (ap. Perceval on the Roman Schism, p. 5.) Our Church shortly after, at the great Council of Frankfort, rejected the Pseudo Synod of Nice, together with the Bishops of Germany and France, (see Palmer on the Church, ii. 200. sqq.) This has never been rescinded, and the state recognizes four specifically, (of which the other two are supplements,) and generally “others” without defining them, (1 Eliz. 1. 36.)—See also, Field and Hammond, ap. Palmer, ii. 171, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Newman on Romanism, Lect. 8. “Indefectibility of the Church Catholic,” p. 250.

<sup>3</sup> See Newman, l. c. p. 243. sqq. ed. 2.



from meeting, that she may not, as a whole, fix any of these errors. What further fulfilments our LORD's promise may have hereafter, we know not ; or whether the Church shall again be at one, and so be in a condition to claim it in any enlarged degree. It might be so ; for although we have broken our traditions, yet might an appeal to those of the Church, when it was yet one, set at rest what now agitates us. For the present, sufficient for us, what has been bestowed in the period of her unity ; the main articles of the faith have been fixed and guarded by her, and we possess them in her Creeds, and believe that the Church shall, by virtue of her SAVIOUR's promise, preserve them to the end. With this, Rome is not content ; *we* take the event, (as it is ever ruled to be) as the interpreter of prophecy ; *she* would bind her LORD to accomplish it in her own way ; will not accept of any thing short of what seems good to her ; settles that the unity essential to its accomplishment, concentrates in herself ; and in this way continues it on to the present time, applies it to every thing, great or small<sup>1</sup> ; and so gathers the promise around and identifies it with herself, and makes it part of her state and majesty. The indefectibility of the Universal Church is to become the safeguard of the one see of Rome, and to draw all other Churches to

<sup>1</sup> " Our sentiment then is, that the Church absolutely cannot err, neither in things absolutely necessary, nor in others, which she proposes to us to be believed or done, whether they are contained in Scripture or no."—Bellarm. Controv. de Eccl. iii. 14.



her footstool. This has been the *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* of Romanism, and her imposture, that she has claimed to herself the promise, which belonged to the whole Church. A high dignity belonged to her as the Apostolic Church of the West; and her traditions, as long as she kept them faithfully, had, naturally, a great estimation, when testimony was to be borne to Catholic truth; but she, instead of being “among the first three,” would be alone; would have her voice not only essential, but alone essential; would make at all events the infallibility of a Council to depend upon the confirmation of her bishop; teaching oftentimes also that even particular Councils approved by the Pope, became infallible, or that a general Council, in itself fallible, acquired an *ex post facto* infallibility through his approval<sup>1</sup>. And thus, like him who was high among “the sons of God,” but would be higher than his Creator made him, she

<sup>1</sup> “It is to be held, as of Catholic faith, that general Councils “confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiff, cannot err, either in faith or “morals.” Bell. Ib. ii. 2. “The 2nd Prop. ‘that particular “Councils confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiff, cannot err in faith “and morals,’ is not equally certain, because that no Catholic “denies, whereas this some do. But I only do not affirm that “it is to be held as of Catholic Faith, because those who hold “the contrary have not *yet* been condemned by the Church as “heretics.”—Ib. c. 9. “General Councils, before the confirma- “tion of the Sovereign Pontiff, may err, unless the fathers in “their definitions follow the instructions of the Pontiff.”—Ib. c. 11. It is enough to stamp the character of Rome, that such perverted views should be favoured by her.

fell. The promise, which was a blessing and a high privilege to the Universal Church, became a snare to her feet, who arrogantly claimed it to herself. Where our LORD lodged it, through His Spirit Which dwelleth in her, it was safe; she who would be wise above that which was assigned her, has for the Spirit of Truth received a lying spirit, too mighty for her to control, and by him been goaded on, to prepare for herself her own destruction. Her claim is the invention of man, not the promise of CHRIST; it bears upon it the stamp of man's contrivance, in its lust of authority, furnishing the pretext for repudiating Canons<sup>1</sup> of Œcumenical Councils, from which Rome, for private ends, withdrew its sanction, and making private synods into Œcumenical and infallible Councils, when its ends are thereby served, setting herself in the place of the Church universal throughout the world: it has the fruit of man's contrivance, leading that unhappy Church into presumptuous definitions of questions, against the voice of Scripture and Antiquity, or to form wrong conclusions from a partial use of either, taking from either the first support of her existing system which comes to hand, without examining carefully whether it do support her or no, as resting in fact not on Scripture or Antiquity, but on her own assumed infallibility; using unrighteous expedients, as one unaccountable and beyond questioning; rash and headstrong in her own defence (as over-confident persons

<sup>1</sup> *E. g.* The 28th Canon of the Council of Ephesus.

are), not giving herself leisure to consider whether she were in the right or no, but obstinately defending each point on which she was censured; and thus multiplying her own perplexities, her precarious theories, and contradictions to Antiquity and Scripture, on which she professes to rest. Thus Satan has led her to the edge of a precipice, and there, by her very claim of infallibility, holds her fast; rendering it humanly impossible for her to retreat, ready to be cast down, unless God by an especial act of mercy, break the bond, "take<sup>1</sup> the prey from the mighty," and bid the "lawful captive" go free. Her vast system rests upon an assumed infallibility; she stands committed to every portion of it; and yet she cannot give account to those whom she holds captive, how they are to know that she is infallible, or in whom this infallibility resides<sup>2</sup>. Nevertheless she stakes her existence on the belief. The Churches under the Roman sway may purify themselves, as did we; Rome herself has no escape (sorrowful as her doom is, which she has drawn upon herself), except through such a confession as those, who have committed themselves so deeply and so presumptuously, very rarely it is to be feared, humble themselves to make. Roman infallibility, then, has no other relation to the doctrine of Indefectibility of the Church, than that of the corruption to the

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xlix. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Newman, *ib.* lect. 4. "Doctrine of Infallibility politically considered," p. 150, ed. 2.

truth which it has corrupted ; the Romanist theory is bound up with *her* doctrine of traditions, she limits the doctrine on the one hand to the portion of the Church in communion with her, and on the other hand extends it to all subjects which that Church may determine ; the Anglican view regards the promise as belonging to the universal Church, but restrained to those Articles of the faith which were delivered to her, and which in her real Œcumenical Councils she has defined ; one may add, the Ultra-Protestant view narrows the promise, like the Church of Rome, in extent, to a handful of believing Christians, and, like Rome also, changes the subjects of the Faith, substituting a system of its own for Catholic truth ; differing, as before, from Rome in this, that what Rome claims to the Churches of her own communion, it applies to individuals <sup>1</sup>.

The contrast between the Roman claim to infallibility, and our Anglican acknowledgment of the indefectibility of the Church, has been so clearly pursued by Mr. Newman <sup>2</sup>, that I must beg permission to insert it.

“ Both we and Romanists hold that the Church

<sup>1</sup> “ When they interpret these promises, so full of exceeding consolation, ‘ Lo, I am with you always,’ and ‘ He shall guide you into all truth,’ as given to the universal Church as a whole, not to individual Christians, what else do they than take away from all Christians the confidence, which ought to result thence for their encouragement ?”—Calv. Institt. 4. 8. 11.

<sup>2</sup> L. c. “ Indefectibility of Church Catholic,” p. 259.



“ Catholic is unerring in its declarations of faith for  
 “ saving doctrine ; but we differ from each other as  
 “ to what is the faith, and what is the Church Catholic.  
 “ They maintain that faith depends on the Church,  
 “ we that the Church is built on faith. By Church  
 “ Catholic we mean the Church Universal, as de-  
 “ scended from the Apostles ; they those branches  
 “ of it which are in communion with Rome. They  
 “ consider the See of St. Peter to have a promise of  
 “ permanence, we the Church Catholic and Apostolic.  
 “ Again, they understand by the Faith, whatever  
 “ the Church at any time declares to be faith ; we  
 “ what it has actually so declared from the beginning.  
 “ We hold that the Church Catholic will never de-  
 “ part from these outlines of doctrine which the  
 “ Apostles formally published ; they that she will  
 “ never depart in any of her acts from that entire  
 “ system, written and oral, public and private, ex-  
 “ plicit and implicit, which they received and taught ;  
 “ we that she has a gift of fidelity, they of dis-  
 “ cretion.”

“ Again, both they and we anathematize those who  
 “ deny the Faith ; but they extend the condemna-  
 “ tion to all who question any decree of the Roman  
 “ Church ; we apply it to those only who deny any  
 “ article of the original Apostolical Creed. The creed  
 “ of Romanism is ever subject to increase ; our’s is,  
 “ fixed once for all. We confine our anathema to the  
 “ Athanasian Creed ; Romanists extend it to Pope  
 “ Pius’s. They cut themselves off from the rest of



“ Christendom ; we cut ourselves off from no branch,  
 “ not even from themselves. We are at peace with  
 “ Rome as regards the essentials of faith ; but she tole-  
 “ rates us as little as any sect or heresy. We admit her  
 “ Baptism and her Orders ; her custom is to rebaptize  
 “ and reordain our members who chance to join her.

“ These distinctions are sufficient for my present  
 “ purpose, though they are only a few out of various  
 “ differences which might be pointed out. They are  
 “ surely portions of a real view, which, while it re-  
 “ lieves the mind of those burdens and perplexities  
 “ which are the portion of the mere Protestant, is  
 “ essentially distinct from Romanism.”

(4) There yet remains one other fear which I would wish to remove, namely, lest this appeal to Christian Antiquity should abate of men’s reverence to their own Church. It is natural that they should dread this, who have looked upon their own Church as a modern Church. To them the authority of their own and the ancient Church must seem to stand in contrast ; to us the authority of either, though not equally full, still goes in the same direction. We wish not to add any thing to our Church, but to develope what she has ; it is admitted by all, that many points, being incidentally noticed in her formularies, need expansion : a modern school would wish to have this done exclusively by reference to the Reformers ; we, thankfully acknowledging her to be a sound member of the Church Catholic, from which her Liturgy is derived, would resort to the fountain

whence our stream is derived, not to the channels through which it has lately passed. We would view her in relation to the whole of which she is a part, the Primitive and Apostolic Church, whence she is descended, to which she belongs, “the rock out of which she was hewed, and the hole of the pit from which she was digged.” This has ever been our profession. “This<sup>1</sup> is the very chiefest advantage which the warmest recommenders of tradition in our Church expect from it, *viz.* that attention to it should very much elevate men’s ideas of the *existing* system, proving it divine in many points, where they now ignorantly suppose it human. This, and not the establishment of any mere theory, new or old, is the immediate object of those who have most earnestly urged, from time to time, the reverential study of Christian antiquity.”

Our own Church is the immediate, the Church universal the ultimate visible authority; she is to us the representative of the Universal Church, as the Church Universal is of her LORD; our own derives her authority from the Universal Church, and cannot claim any, contrary to her: we belong to her, because we were baptized in her, and she is the descendant of the primitive Church in this land, and her Bishops “the successors of the Apostles:” we receive as Articles of Faith, what she delivers to us as fixed by the Universal Church; what she has by

<sup>1</sup> Keble, Postscript to 3rd edit. of Sermon on Tradition, p. 62. See also Pref. to St. Augustine’s Confessions, p. viii. ix.

her private judgment deduced from Holy Scripture, we teach because we also think it to be so deducible ; if we did not so think, we should obey, must belong to her, but could not teach : her Sacraments we receive, because she has received the commission to impart them ; her rites, because she has the power to ordain or to change them. To our own Church we owe submission ; to the decisions of the Church universal, Faith.

This relation, in which we stand as members both of a particular Church, and of the "Holy Church Universal," is expressed with such pious humility by Archbishop Bramhall, that I too cannot but beg to express, in his language, what our wishes would be, as far as any of us may, or are forced to, speak of ourselves. "No<sup>1</sup> one can justly blame me for honouring my spiritual mother, the Church of England, in whose womb I was conceived, at whose breasts I was nourished, and in whose bosom I hope to die." Yet though his love was to his immediate mother, his allegiance was more especially to the "mother of us all." He proceeds after a while : "Howsoever it be, I submit myself and my poor endeavours, first to the judgment of the Catholic Ecumenical essential Church, which if some of late days have endeavoured to hiss out of the Schools as a fancy, I cannot help it. From the beginning it was not so. And if I should mistake the right Catholic Church

<sup>1</sup> Works, p. 141, quoted more fully by Mr. Newman on Romanism ; Advertisement.

“ out of human frailty or ignorance (which for my  
 “ part I have no reason in the world to suspect, yet  
 “ it is not impossible when the Romanists themselves  
 “ are divided into five or six several opinions, what  
 “ this Catholic Church, or what their infallible Judge  
 “ is,) I do implicitly and in the preparation of my  
 “ mind submit myself to the True Catholic Church,  
 “ the Spouse of Christ, the Mother of the Saints,  
 “ the Pillar of Truth. And seeing my adherence is  
 “ firmer to the Infallible Rule of Faith, that is, the  
 “ Holy Scriptures interpreted by the Catholic Church,  
 “ than to mine own private judgment or opinions ;  
 “ although I should unwittingly fall into an error, yet  
 “ this cordial submission is an implicit retractation  
 “ thereof, and I am confident will be so accepted by  
 “ the Father of Mercies, both from me and all others  
 “ who seriously and sincerely do seek after peace and  
 “ truth.

“ Likewise I submit myself to the Representative  
 “ Church, that is, a free general Council, or as general  
 “ as can be procured ; and until then to the Church  
 “ of England, wherein I was baptized, or to a national  
 “ English Synod. To the determination of all which,  
 “ and each of these respectively, according to the  
 “ distinct degree of their authority, I yield a *con-*  
 “ *formity* and *compliance*, or at the least and to the  
 “ lowest of them an *acquiescence*.”

I have dwelt the longer upon this subject, because  
 upon it some of the most vehement charges of ap-



proximating to Rome have of late been founded ; it were easier to draw a parallel (as has in part been done) between the Romanist and Ultra-Protestant.

(1) Both agree in appealing to *their own* interpretation of Holy Scripture against the agreement of Catholic antiquity<sup>1</sup>. (2) Both claim to this case

<sup>1</sup> See Mr. Newman on Romanism, Lect. 7.—“ Instances of the abuse of private judgment,” § 5, 6. where he shows that Purgatory and the Pope’s Supremacy came in through misapplication of Scripture, *against* tradition. In like way, the right to administer the Holy Eucharist in one kind, is rested on passages of Scripture, Luke xxiv. 30. 35. Acts ii. 42. 46 ; xx. 7 ; xxvii. 35. which would be very strong, were not all tradition of all Churches for nearly thirteen centuries against it. Other instances of this abuse of Scripture argument are quoted in Mr. Newman’s work. The same was observed by Bp. Jewell, who in his “ reply to Dr. Cole,” (Works, p. 43.) thus puts a number of them together. “ Howbeit, of such reasons ye have store enough, as I were able to show you at large, if need so required. As where ye say :

Extra de	Quæ sunt potestates à Deo ordinatæ sunt :	The
Majoritate	powers that be are ordered by God :	
et obedi-	Ergo, The Pope is above the Emperor.	
entia.	Spiritualis à nemine judicatur :	The man that is
	ruled by God’s Spirit, is judged of no man :	
Cap. unam	Ergo, No man may judge the Pope.	
Sanctam.	Sancti estote, quoniam ego sanctus sum :	Be ye
	holy, for I am holy, saith the Lord :	
Innocentius	Ergo, No married man may be a Priest.	
dist. 82 Pro-	Christ said unto Peter, Solve pro me et te :	Pay
posuisti :	the tribute for me and thee :	
Roffensis	Ergo, The Pope is head of the Church.	
Durandus.	Ecclesiasticus saith, In medio ecclesiæ aperuit os	
	suum : He opened his mouth in the midst of the	
	congregation :	

the presence and infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit, the Romanist as promised to the Church, the Ultra-Protestant as promised to individuals<sup>1</sup>.

	Ergo, The Priest must turn round at the midst of the Altar.
Concilium Nicenum	Fecit Deus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem suam : God made man to the image and likeness of Himself :
Secundum sub Iren.	Ergo, There must be images in the Church.
Concilium Basil. sub Eugenio.	Papa juratur in fidem Apostolicam : The Pope is sworn to the Apostles' faith :
Concilium Rom. sub Silvestro.	Ergo, The Church cannot err.
The Canonists,	Non est discipulus supra magistrum : There is no scholar above his master :
Durandus.	Ergo, No man may judge the Pope.
	Papa est dominus omnium beneficiorum : The Pope is Lord of all benefits :
	Ergo, He cannot commit simony, though he would.
Eckius.	Domini est terra et plenitudo ejus : The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof :
Dr. Cole at Westminster.	Ergo, The Communion cake must be made round.
	Omnis spiritus laudet Dominum : Let all spirits praise the Lord :
	Ergo, Ye must have organs in the Church.
	Lac vobis potum dedi : or, Ignorantia est mater pietatis : I gave you milk to drink ; or, Ignorance is the mother of devotion :
	Ergo, The people must make their prayers in a strange tongue."

<sup>1</sup> *E. g.* Mr. Scott, "Force of Truth," (v. fin.) thus vindicates his absolute certainty of the truth of the Calvinistic system—"Supposing this narration true, (for which the appeal is made to "the heart-searching God,) and supposing the promises mentioned

(3) Both appeal (though Ultra-Protestants less now than formerly) to individual Fathers, when they make for them, and set them aside when against them<sup>1</sup>.

(4) Both will take one Father who sides with them, against the whole stream of Antiquity if against them.

(5) Both hold, that the Spirit had reserved for these later times, what He denied to the earlier; that certain truth may now be arrived at, where the Ancient Church was in doubt and error<sup>2</sup>; only,

‘to be proposed to us, that we may embrace them, depend on them, and plead them in prayer, considering the glory of the Divine veracity as concerned in their accomplishment to every believer; let them try whether they can possibly evade one of these two conclusions—either that God hath failed of His promise, or that he hath in the main, and as far as is expressed, led the author by His Holy Spirit to the knowledge and belief of the truth.’ In like way, “Essays on the Church,” p. 304.

<sup>1</sup> Thus Basnage (*Hist. des Eglises Réformées*, P. i. c. 6. § 4.) appeals to Clemens Romanus, in behalf of his view of justification by faith, supposing the truth to have been obscured or lost ever after in Christian Antiquity.

<sup>2</sup> See Mr. Newman on “Romanism.” So again Bp. Jewell, l. c. “It is a world, to consider the reason ye use to prove your purpose withal. For ye say, the Church in Christ’s and the Apostles’ time was but an infant; but now she is well-stricken in age, therefore she must be otherwise dieted now than she was then. This is not the handsomest comparison that I have heard of. For I never heard before now that Christ and His Apostles were called infants; or that ever any man before now took upon him to set them to school. Esay saith, that Christ should be Pater futuri seculi; that is, the Father of the world to come, which is the time of the Gospel. And St. Hierom, in your own Decrees, calleth the

again, the Romanist claims this enlarged illumination or inspiration to the Church; Ultra-Protestants to Individuals. (6) Both prefer what is modern to what is ancient, what is further from the source, to what is nearer. (7) Both deeply disparage Christian antiquity. And this agreement is not accidental, but arises from the same source in each, that each has to support modern corruptions of doctrine, unknown to Christian Antiquity, and therefore appeals against her, and will not trust itself to her, as knowing beforehand that they will be condemned by her. And so it is scarcely uncharitable to suspect, that, beneath this professed and conscious dread, lest an appeal to tradition should give Rome an advantage, there lurks also a secret and unconscious or half-conscious dread for themselves: they have good reason to suspect, if they do not absolutely know, that Christian Antiquity is against them, and so they would anticipate the blow, by stifling it; they fear that her voice should be listened to, and so would drown it, by their outcries against her; and while they close the ear

“ Apostles, Patres, that is not infants, but the Fathers of the  
 “ Church. And I believe, though ye would study and labour for  
 “ it, yet would it be very hard for you, either to find out any good  
 “ substantial reason, wherefore ye with your brethren ought to be  
 “ called the Fathers of God’s Church, or Christ and His Apostles  
 “ ought to be called babes. O that ye would indifferently com-  
 “ pare the one with the other! ye should find, that as like as ye  
 “ and your Bishops are to the Apostles, so like is your Church to  
 “ the Apostles’ Church.”



against her, as if she would give witness for Rome, which she would not give, they hope to escape hearing the testimony which she would give against the Anti-sacramental system of Geneva.

But this is an alarming course, and the irreverential spirit in which it is begun, bodes but ill of its termination. It were an ungrateful task, were any to set themselves systematically to show that Christian Antiquity were not to be trusted; yet this would require patience and research; but what must one think of the piety and reverence, which would make sport with the supposed defects of the Fathers of the Church, and discover their father's shame; which would repeat from mouth to mouth the one or other saying, which themselves had first misunderstood and distorted, in order triumphantly to ask, what could be thought of the judgment of men who could so speak? Truly, it seems like the Philistines making sport with the mighty man whose eyes they had first put out, and likely to meet with their end. It was scarcely in so irreverential, but in the same sceptical spirit, that Semler, the parent of German Neology, began unravelling the belief of his country: but the criticism of the Fathers mounted up to the criticism of the Apostles; and the criticism of the Apostles to that of their LORD; and the disbelief in their LORD is in its last stage become a dethroning of GOD, and a setting up of self, a Pantheism which worships God as enshrined in self.

This subject, upon which I have detained your

Lordship so long, may also, as the first instance of the supposed Romanist tendency of some principles of our great Divines, illustrate how mistaken is the ground of these vague fears. Opposed errors will often meet: truth will not approximate to either, though if looked upon on either side, it will seem to be nearer to the opposite than these are to each other. The proverbial truth tells us "extremes meet," as in this case also is verified; whereas the mean which our Church holds will never meet with either extreme; they parted off from it; and however slight the original divergence, become more and more widely separated from it, and never again join. To a careless or superficial thinker, the mean seems likely to join the extreme, because it has in it some quality which is wanting to the other extreme; but it is not so; it agrees with the extreme, not in essentials, but in something incidental; the rash man appears to have one quality in common with the brave one, in that he exposes himself to danger; the brave man's caution may readily appear like cowardice; and so the rash thinks the brave cowardly, and the coward holds him to be rash; whereas the exposing himself to danger or no, is but an accident; the principle on which he does it, or refrains from it, is that which constitutes his character; he then will neither be rash nor cowardly; but the coward will be rash, and the rash will be cowardly, if emergencies so determine. Prodigality and avarice seem to be contraries; yet are they continually united, as in Catiline, "*alieni ap-*

“ *petens, sui profusus* :” he who is simply liberal, will be neither, though by either extreme he will be confounded with the other. “Extremes meet,” because they proceed on no settled principle, but on passion ; they are guided by no internal rules, but are blown about, this way or that, by the force of outward circumstances ; the mean goes on fixed principles, and therefore holds on an even course, undeviating and therefore never approximating to either extreme. And so our English Church has by the Church of Rome been confounded with Ultra-Protestants, and by Ultra-Protestants has ever been thought to approximate to Rome. In the present instance, it is but accident that Rome appeals to Antiquity, or Ultra-Protestantism to Scripture ; both have an ulterior object, to maintain their own system ; but Romanism will found its errors on Scripture, or will disparage Christian Antiquity with Ultra-Protestantism. And Ultra-Protestantism, in its turn, will neglect the plain meaning of Scripture, or appeal to Christian Antiquity, to establish views formed independently of Antiquity ; whereas the genuine English system, being founded on Holy Scripture as interpreted by Christian Antiquity, possesses a deep reverence for Scripture as the source of the Faith, and for Antiquity, as its witness and expositor ; and appealing to both, for the office assigned to them by Him who gave them, has only so much in common with either extreme that it holds the truth which they have perverted, but approximates in no way to their errors.

Art. XI. *Of the Justification of Man.*

“Justification” having been lately the subject of a very elaborate and meditative work by one<sup>1</sup> of those accused of departing from the Articles, it is the less necessary to trouble your Lordship with any lengthened detail upon it. Had they, who bring charges, studied and mastered it, they might have been benefitted by it, and these charges been spared. The XIth Article bears the appearance, on its very face, of being a protest against Romish error; it does not pretend to embrace in a few lines the whole subject of justification; it contents itself with securing one main point; it puts in strong contrast the merits of CHRIST and the merits of man, and says, that we are justified solely for the sake of His merit, and not for our own works and deservings; and that merit, it further says, is made available to us through faith. “We are accounted righteous before God, only *for* the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ *by* Faith, and not *for* our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.” The Article, then, opposes the merit of CHRIST to any thing which we have of our own, to “our own works and deservings,” as the *meritorious* cause of salvation; and thus far, we believe, little is

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Newman's Lectures on Justification.



imputed to us. It is so plain a truth, and has been so often inculcated by us, that every sin of man which is remitted, is remitted only for the sake of His meritorious Cross and Passion, every good and acceptable work is such through His power working in us, that little, I believe, has thus far been objected. The objections have been founded, not on the Article, but on men's inferences from it. The Article opposes "Faith" as the origin of our justification, to works; it excludes works from being any meritorious cause of justification; "faith only" means in its language "faith, not works." A modern school has very strangely extended the reference of the Article, and opposed man's faith to the Sacrament of His LORD. They say, "faith only" means, that Faith, —as opposed to every thing else, not works only, but Baptism,—is *the* channel whereby the merits of CHRIST are conveyed to the soul to its justification.

But, my Lord, such a contrast was plainly neither in the minds of the writers of the Article, nor is it in their words; the whole subject of Baptism was altogether foreign to that which is handled in *this* whole series of articles on the relation of faith to works, before and after justification; (ix—xvii.) the writers specify what they do mean; they exclude man's works; they refer every thing to the merits of CHRIST: "by faith only" excludes, then, man's works, not any thing which is not man's. Whether He be pleased to convey justification directly to the believer's soul, or through His own ordinance of Bap-

tism, is wholly foreign to their subject. They say nothing about it one way or other, as neither had they any occasion, since the questions which have so agitated us of late, as to the efficacy of Baptism, had not then been raised in our Church. Neither again does the Article say any thing about the means whereby man is retained in a justified state, nor wherein our justification consists; so that it may be perfectly true, that we are “justified by faith only,” as the means whereby *we* receive it, and yet through Baptism as the means or channel, through which God conveys it; or “by the Spirit” as the sanctifying Presence which makes us acceptable in God’s sight; or “by works,” as St. James says, as that by which the Justification is continued on in us; or, as it has lately been very concisely and clearly expressed<sup>1</sup>, “Justification comes *through* the Sacraments; is received *by* faith, *consists* in God’s inward Presence, and *lives* in obedience.”

The same is in part expressed by one who was in his day a pillar of our Church against heresy<sup>2</sup>. “The merits of Christ *applied in Baptism by the Spirit*, and *received by a lively faith*, complete our justification for the time being.” As well then might it be inferred that “justification by faith only” excluded the indwelling of the Spirit, on its first imparting,

<sup>1</sup> Newman on Justification, lect. 12. “Faith viewed relatively to rites and works,” p. 318.

<sup>2</sup> Waterland on Justification, quoted by Mr. Newman, p. 154, note.

or good works as necessary to its continuance, as that it excludes Baptism as the channel whereby God bestows it. Whatever charge then is conceived to lie against this view will equally hold against the earlier Non-conformists<sup>1</sup>, who had not reduced Justification to a mere imputation, but regarded it as resulting from the indwelling of the Spirit. In Mr. Newman's words<sup>2</sup>, on the relation of Justification by faith to Justification by works, "If indeed I said that works 'justify in *the same sense* as faith only justifies, this 'would be a contradistinction in terms; but faith 'only may justify in one sense, good works in another, 'and this is all that is here maintained. After all, 'does not Christ only justify? How is it that the 'doctrine of faith justifying does not interfere with 'our Lord's being the sole justifier? It will of 'course be replied, that our Lord is the meritorious 'cause, and faith the means; that faith justifies in 'a different and subordinate sense. As then Christ 'justifies *in the sense* in which He justifies, alone, 'yet faith also justifies in its own sense; so works, 'whether moral or ritual, may justify us in their 'own respective senses, though in the sense in which 'faith justifies it only justifies.—Indeed, is not this 'argument, as has been suggested already, the very 'weapon of the Arians in their warfare against the 'Son of God? They said, Christ is not God, be-

<sup>1</sup> *E. g.* Baxter quoted by Mr. Newman, l. c.

<sup>2</sup> Lect. xii. "Faith viewed relatively to Rites and Works," p. 316.

“cause the Father is called the *only* God.” And again: “The instrumental power of Faith cannot interfere with the instrumental power of Baptism; because Faith is the *sole* justifier, not in contrast to all means and agencies whatever (for it is not surely in contrast to our Lord’s merits, or God’s mercy), but to all other *graces*. When, then, Faith is called the sole instrument, this means the *sole internal* instrument, not the sole instrument of any kind.

“There is nothing inconsistent, then, in Faith being the sole instrument of justification, and yet Baptism also the sole instrument, and that at the same time, because in distinct senses; an inward instrument in no way interfering with an outward instrument <sup>1</sup>.”

And this connection of Justification with Baptism, so far from being at variance with the homily to which the Article refers, and which men now quote in behalf of a contrary view, is implied by its very outset. For in the first words it lays down the necessity man has of a justification out of himself, which is what the Article requires. “Because all men be sinners and offenders against God, and breakers of His law and commandment, therefore can no man by his own acts, works, and deeds (seem they never so good) be justified, and made righteous before God; but every man of necessity

<sup>1</sup> Lect. x. “Justification by Faith only,” p. 259.



“is constrained to seek for another righteousness or  
 “justification to be received at God’s own hands,  
 “that is to say, the forgiveness of his sins and tres-  
 “passes, in such things as he hath offended.” Then  
 it speaks of this justification as being bestowed by  
 God, and received by faith. “And this justification  
 “or righteousness which we so receive of God’s  
 “mercy and Christ’s merits, *embraced by faith*, is taken,  
 “accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and  
 “full justification.” And then, having named the  
 Sacrifice of CHRIST as the *meritorious* cause of our  
 justification, the writer proceeds: “Insomuch that  
 “infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy,  
 “are by this Sacrifice washed from their sins, brought  
 “to God’s favour, and made His children and in-  
 “heritors of His kingdom of heaven. And they  
 “which in act or deed do sin after their Baptism,  
 “when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are  
 “likewise washed by this Sacrifice from their sins, in  
 “such sort that there remaineth not any spot of sin,  
 “that shall be imputed to their damnation.” “Here,”  
 observes Mr. Newman<sup>1</sup>, “is distinct mention of faith  
 “justifying *after* Baptism, but no mention of its jus-  
 “tifying *before* Baptism; on the contrary, Baptism  
 “is expressly said to effect the first justification.”  
 “The writer proceeds: ‘*This* is that justification or  
 “righteousness which St. Paul speaks of, when he  
 “saith, No man is justified by the works of the

<sup>1</sup> Lect. x. “Justification by Faith only,” p. 263.

“Law, but freely by faith in Jesus Christ.’ So it “seems that St. Paul too, when he speaks of justification through faith, speaks of faith as subordinate “to Baptism, not as the immediate initiation into a “justified state.”

So again Dr. Heylin<sup>1</sup> sums up this same statement of the homily: “There we find, that by God’s “mercy and the virtue of that Sacrifice which our “High Priest and Saviour Christ Jesus, the Son “of God, once offered for us upon the Cross, we do “obtain God’s grace, and remission as well of our “original sin in Baptism, as of all actual sin committed by us after Baptism, if we truly repent and “turn unfeignedly unto Him again. Which doctrine “of the Church of England, as it is consonant to the “word of God, in Holy Scripture, so is it also most “agreeable to the common and received judgment “of pure antiquity.”

The doctrine of Justification through Baptism is not opposed then to Justification by Faith only, in the sense of the Article, although it is to the theory which some have constructed upon it. “The necessity of Baptism,” says Bishop Bull<sup>2</sup>, “and of those “things which prepare for Baptism, in order to “obtain remission of sins, which is set forth in “sundry places of Scripture, and occurs in almost

<sup>1</sup> On the Apostles’ Creed, Art. x. c. vi. quoted in *Catena Patrum*, No. ii. Tracts, No. 76. “Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration,” p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> *Apol. pro Harmon. S.* 4. § 9.

“every page of the Ancients, is alone a sufficient  
 “argument to overthrow *that* solifidianism, which  
 “many have attempted to build up out of Holy  
 “Scripture and the testimonies of the Fathers; as  
 “our most learned and pious Thorndike, of blessed  
 “memory, has evinced in different places of his writ-  
 “ings. For it appears hence, that faith by itself  
 “does not suffice to obtain justification; but that  
 “outward Baptism is required besides, when it may  
 “be had; but that at all events that promise of  
 “a new life, which is wont to be made at Baptism,  
 “is of necessity required;” and, again<sup>1</sup>, “In the  
 “New Testament, John Baptist is said to have been  
 “sent by God, ‘to preach the baptism of repentance  
 “to the remission of sins,’ where are set down  
 “together the end and the means leading thereto:  
 “the end is remission of sins or justification; the  
 “means our Baptism and repentance.”

There is, however, another wide difference between the views which we have inherited from, “to say the least, the greater number of English Divines,” and those now held by a large portion of the Church, resulting from our different views of the connection of justification with Baptism. The view prevalent with this class appears to have been borrowed from Luther, and so to be nearly that condemned by the Council of Trent, that “Justifying<sup>2</sup> faith is nothing

<sup>1</sup> Ib. S. 3. § 12.

<sup>2</sup> Sess. 6. can. 12.

“else than a reliance (fiducia) on the Divine mercy  
 “remitting sins for Christ’s sake, or that it is this  
 “reliance alone whereby we are justified.” The Tri-  
 dentine doctrine on the contrary is, that “Justifica-  
 “tion is not merely the remission of sins, but also  
 “the sanctification and renewal of the inward man  
 “by his voluntary reception of grace and gifts.  
 “Whence a man becomes righteous for unrighteous,  
 “a friend [of God] for an enemy, so as to be an heir  
 “according to the hope of eternal life, and the com-  
 “munication of the merits of the Passion of our  
 “Lord Jesus Christ. This takes place in the very  
 “act of the justification of the ungodly, in that,  
 “through the merit of His most Holy Passion, the  
 “love of God is through the Holy Spirit shed abroad  
 “in the hearts of those who are justified, and becomes  
 “inherent in them, whence in the very act of justi-  
 “fication, man, together with the remission of sins,  
 “receives infused into him, through Jesus Christ, in  
 “Whom he is engrafted, faith, hope, and charity.”  
 The Anglican doctrine,<sup>1</sup> or that which we conceive to  
 have been the teaching of the majority of our Church,  
 differs from both these: from the Roman, in that it  
 excludes sanctification from having any place in our  
 justification; from the Lutheran, in that it conceives  
 justification to be not imputation merely, but the act  
 of GOD imparting His Divine Presence to the soul,  
 through Baptism, and so making us temples of the

<sup>1</sup> Sess. 6. can. 7.



Holy Ghost, "the<sup>1</sup> habitation in us of God the Father, and the Word incarnate through the Holy Ghost:" or to quote a fuller passage<sup>2</sup>, "It may be remarked that whatever blessings in detail we ascribe to justification, are ascribed in Scripture to this sacred indwelling. For instance, is justification *remission of sins*? the Gift of the Spirit conveys it, as is evident from the Scripture doctrine about Baptism; 'One Baptism for the remission of sins.' Is justification *adoption* into the family of God? in like manner the Spirit is expressly called the Spirit of adoption, 'the Spirit whereby we cry, Abba, Father.' Is justification *reconciliation* with God? St. Paul says, 'Jesus Christ is in you, unless ye be reprobates.' Is justification *life*? the same Apostle says, 'Christ liveth in me.' Is justification given to *faith*? he also prays 'that Christ may dwell in' Christians' 'hearts by faith.' Does justification lead to holy *obedience*? Our Lord assures us that 'he that abideth in Him and He in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit.' Is it through justification that we rejoice in *hope of the glory* of God? in like manner 'Christ in us' is said to be 'the hope of glory.' "

The three views of doctrine part widely in their practical effects; the Lutheran<sup>3</sup> view, especially as

<sup>1</sup> Newman on Justif. Lect. 6. "On the gift of Righteousness," p. 160.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. p. 166, 7.

<sup>3</sup> The Council of Trent condemns those who hold "that it is

developed in the Wesleyans and a section of our Church, leads men to look to their own *feelings*, as that by which their reliance on Christ may be ascertained, to analyze them, operate upon them, work them up, rely at last with satisfaction upon them, as tests of their love for CHRIST. They have been taught that justification is not the gift of God through His Sacraments, but the result of a certain frame of mind, of a going forth of themselves, and resting themselves upon their Saviour; this is the *act* whereby they think themselves to have been justified; and so, as another would revert to his Baptism, and his engrafting into Christ, and his thus being *in* Christ, so do they to this act whereby *they* were justified; they cherish their then feelings, not to act upon them, but for their own sakes; mourn over their fading<sup>1</sup>; endeavour to reproduce them; make their Christian life to concentrate in them; and lose out of sight, as carnal and legal, its ordinary, hourly duties. These tendencies, doubtless, are checked in individuals; but whatever checks

“ necessary to every man to obtain remission of sins, that he  
 “ should believe assuredly and without any doubt, that the sins of  
 “ his own infirmity and indisposition are remitted to him,” and  
 “ that a man is thereby absolved from sins and justified, that he  
 “ believes assuredly that he is absolved and justified, and that no  
 “ one is truly justified, unless he believes that he is justified, and  
 “ that by *this* faith alone absolution and justification are perfected.”  
 (Sess. 6. Can. 13, 14.) which is just the Wesleyan doctrine.

<sup>1</sup> This feeling is encouraged in popular hymns, irregularly admitted into our Churches, as in that, “ Oh for a closer walk with

there are, are the result of past duty, of an implanted integrity, of God's law within them, in despite of their system. Their tendency is to act upon a theory, not upon Scripture; to suppose that if the feelings be right, the acts will, as a matter of course, be right; and so to neglect that about which Scripture bids them be diligent. To take the most systematic developement of this theory; the first thought which occurs to the mind of a Wesleyan, in speaking of his spiritual state, is, not what temptations he has surmounted, or failed in, what duties he has neglected, or performed, but, what were his feelings? His "experience" concentrates in these.

"True faith," observes Mr. Newman<sup>1</sup>, "is what God." What a strong contrast with the peace resulting from continued growth in grace are such lines as :

Where is the happiness I knew  
*When first I knew the Lord;*  
 And felt the heart-reviving view  
 Of Jesus and His word?  
 What peaceful hours I *then* enjoyed!  
 How sweet their memory still!  
 But *now* I feel a painful void  
 No human joys can fill.

Such lines would describe truly a backsliding Christian, or a dejected one, who had been taught to make his feelings the test of his state; but they are too likely to make one think himself backsliding, because his feelings are not what they were. The more practical view is given in Mr. Newman's Sermons, vol. i. "On the use of excited feelings in religion."

<sup>1</sup> On Justification, Lect. 13. "On preaching the Gospel," p. 385.

“ may be called colourless, like air or water ; it is  
 “ but the medium through which the soul sees  
 “ Christ ; and the soul as little really rests upon it  
 “ and contemplates it, as the eye can see the air.  
 “ When, then, men are bent on holding it (as it  
 “ were) in their hands, curiously inspecting, analyz-  
 “ ing, and so aiming at it, they are obliged to colour  
 “ and thicken it, that it may be seen and touched.  
 “ That is, they substitute for it, something or other,  
 “ a feeling, notion, sentiment, conviction, or act of  
 “ reason, which they may hang over and dote upon.  
 “ They rather aim at experiences (as they are called)  
 “ within them, than at Him that is without them.  
 “ They are led to enlarge upon the signs of conver-  
 “ sion, the variations of their feelings, their aspira-  
 “ tions and longings, and to tell all this to others ;—  
 “ to tell others how they fear, and hope, and sin,  
 “ and rejoice, and renounce themselves, and rest in  
 “ Christ only ; how conscious they are that they are  
 “ but ‘ filthy rags,’ and all is of grace, till in fact they  
 “ have little time left them to guard against what  
 “ they are condemning, and to exercise what they  
 “ seem to themselves to be so full of. Now men in  
 “ a battle are brief-spoken ; they realize their situa-  
 “ tion and are intent upon it. . . . . By-standers  
 “ see our minds ; but our minds, if healthy, see but  
 “ the objects which possess them. As God’s grace  
 “ elicits our faith, so His holiness stirs our fear, and  
 “ His glory kindles our love. Others may say of  
 “ us ‘ here is faith’ and ‘ there is conscientiousness’



“and ‘there is love,’ but we can only say, ‘this is God’s grace,’ and ‘that is His holiness,’ and ‘that is His glory.’”

Just the reverse of this is the Romanist. His theory leads men as naturally to look chiefly to their works, and as it has a Pelagian *tendency* (although it has been held together with high Augustinian doctrine) so may it readily lead them to look to their own works as their own; to weigh them, balance them, evil against good, make the one compensate for the other, settle their several values; at last, hold the ALMIGHTY their debtor, as if the more eminent saints had a supererogation of merits. “It makes,” to use Mr. Newman’s<sup>1</sup> words, “its heavenly grace a matter of purchase and trade.” “Romanism,” as he again says<sup>2</sup>, “by its pretence of Infallibility, lowers the standard and quality of Gospel obedience, as well as impairs its mysterious and sacred character; and this in various ways. When religion is reduced in all its parts to a system, there is hazard of something earthly being made the chief object of our contemplation instead of our Maker. Now Romanism classifies our duties and their rewards, the things to do, the modes of pleasing God, the penalties and the remedies of sin, with such exactness, that an indi-

<sup>1</sup> On Justification, Lect. 8. “Righteousness viewed as a gift and as a quality,” p. 221.

<sup>2</sup> On Romanism, &c. Lect. 3. “Doctrine of Infallibility morally considered,” p. 125.

“vidual knows (so to speak) just where he is upon his  
 “journey heavenward, how far he is got, how much  
 “he has to pass, and his duties become a matter of  
 “calculation. It provides us with a sort of graduated  
 “scale of devotion and obedience, and engrosses our  
 “thoughts with the details of a mere system, to a  
 “comparative forgetfulness of its professed Author.  
 “But it is evident that the purest religious services  
 “are those which are done, not by constraint, but  
 “voluntarily, as a free offering to Almighty God.—  
 “True faith does not like to realize to itself what  
 “it does; it throws off the thought of it; it is  
 “carried on and reaches forward towards perfection,  
 “not counting the steps it has ascended, but keep-  
 “ing the end steadily in its eye, knowing only that  
 “it is advancing, and glorying in each sacrifice or  
 “service which it is allowed to offer, as it occurs,  
 “not remembering it afterwards. But in Romanism  
 “there would seem to be little room for this uncon-  
 “scious devotion. Each deed has its price, every  
 “quarter of the land of promise is laid down and  
 “described. Roads are carefully marked out, and  
 “such as would attain to perfection are constrained  
 “to move in certain lines, as if there were a science  
 “of gaining heaven. Thus the Saints are cut off  
 “from the Christian multitude by certain fixed  
 “duties, not rising out of it by the continuous  
 “growth and flowing forth of services which in their  
 “substance pertain to all men. And Christian holi-  
 “ness in consequence, loses its freshness, vigour, and

“ comeliness, being frozen (as it were) into certain  
 “ attitudes, which are not graceful except when un-  
 “ studied.

“ The injury resulting to the multitude from the  
 “ same circumstance, is of a different but not less  
 “ serious nature. While, of those who aim at the  
 “ more perfect obedience, many are made self-satis-  
 “ fied, and still more formal, the mass of Christians are  
 “ either discouraged from attempting or countenanced  
 “ in neglecting it. If, indeed, there is one offence  
 “ more than the rest characteristic of Romanism, it  
 “ is this, its indulging the carnal tastes of the mul-  
 “ titude of men, setting a limit to their necessary  
 “ obedience, and absolving them from the duty of  
 “ sacrificing their whole lives to God.”

The Anglican doctrine directs men to look neither  
 to their faith nor their works, but to CHRIST alone,  
 “ the Author and Finisher of their faith,” not stay-  
 ing to analyze their feelings, nor weighing their  
 works in a balance, as if claiming Heaven either by  
 faith or works, but looking simply to Him, striving  
 to follow Him, to do as He bids; to act as He  
 guides; to look off from things behind, to press for-  
 ward to things before, as having Him ever before  
 our eyes, Whose Goodness and Greatness and Holi-  
 ness and Glory are immeasurable, yet Who bade us  
 follow in His steps, and “ in Whom instrengthening”  
 (ἐνδυναμοῦντι), because indwelling, St. Paul “could  
 do all things;” “ Who<sup>1</sup> is our Righteousness, by

<sup>1</sup> Newman on Justif. Lect. 6. “ On the gift of Righteousness,”  
 p. 167.

“ dwelling in us by the Spirit ; justifies us by entering  
 “ into us ; continues to justify us by remaining in us.  
 “ This is really and truly our justification, not faith,  
 “ not holiness, [with the Romanist] not (much less)  
 “ a mere imputation [with the Lutheran] but through  
 “ God’s mercy, the very Presence of Christ.”

I would not be understood to rest the defence of any doctrine, in any degree, upon its apparent tendencies ; we are not judges of them ; and might readily mistake them ; and certainly should, if we would on any such *à priori* grounds decide doctrines to be scriptural or unscriptural ; yet, being persuaded that this doctrine is both Scriptural and Catholic, we may speak of its tendencies, with a view to abate a prejudice against it. And in this view the writer so often quoted contrasts it with those of Romanism and Ultra-Protestantism.

“ I say <sup>1</sup> the view of justification taken by Roman-  
 “ ists and by a school of divines among ourselves,  
 “ tends to fix the mind on self, not on Christ, whereas  
 “ that which I have advocated as Scriptural and  
 “ Catholic, buries self in the absorbing vision of a  
 “ present, an indwelling God. And as so doing, it  
 “ is a more awakening and fearful doctrine even than  
 “ that mode of teaching which insists mainly and di-  
 “ rectly on our responsibilities and duties. For to  
 “ what does it point as the great and immediate con-  
 “ dition of justification ? to faith and holiness of our

<sup>1</sup> Lect. 8. “ Righteousness viewed as a gift and a quality,”  
 p. 220.



“ own? or, on the other hand, to the mere title of  
 “ righteousness, which cannot be literally approached  
 “ or profaned by us? no,—but to the glorious She-  
 “ kinah of the Word Incarnate, as to the true wed-  
 “ ding garment in which the soul must be dressed.  
 “ Does not such a view far increase, instead of di-  
 “ minishing our responsibilities? does it not make us  
 “ more watchful and more obedient, while it comforts  
 “ and transports us? Surely it takes our minds off  
 “ ourselves in order to fill us with triumph, awe, and  
 “ godly fear at what we are and what we hold within  
 “ us. When are we the more likely to dread sinning,  
 “ when we know merely we ought to dread it, or  
 “ when we see the exceeding peril of it? When are  
 “ we the more likely to keep awake and be sober,  
 “ when we have a present treasure now to lose, or a  
 “ distant reward to gain? Is it not more dreadful,  
 “ when evil thoughts assail us, more elevating and  
 “ ennobling in affliction, more kindling in danger  
 “ and hardship, to reflect (if the words may be said),  
 “ that we bear God within us, as the Martyr Ignatius,  
 “ expresses it, that He is grieved by us or suffers  
 “ with us according as we carry or renounce His  
 “ Cross,—I say, has not this thought more of per-  
 “ suasiveness in it to do and suffer for Him than the  
 “ views of doctrine which have spread among us? Is  
 “ it not more constraining than that which considers  
 “ that the Gospel comes to us in name, not in power;  
 “ deeper, and more sacred than a second, which  
 “ makes its heavenly grace a matter of purchase and

“ trade ; more glowing than a third, which depresses  
 “ it almost to the chill temperature of natural re-  
 “ ligious ?”

I cannot refrain from adding one more passage, in which he winds up his glowing rehearsal of the devotions of the early Christians whose life was faith, and their faith, not a speculation, but their life :

“ They <sup>1</sup> had Christ before them ; His thought in  
 “ their minds, His emblems in their eye, His Name  
 “ in their mouths, His service in their postures, mag-  
 “ nifying Him, and calling on all that lives to magnify  
 “ Him, joining with angels in heaven and saints in pa-  
 “ radise to bless and praise Him for ever and ever. O  
 “ great and noble system, not of the Jews who rested  
 “ in their rites and privileges, not of Christians who  
 “ are taken up with their own feelings, and who de-  
 “ scribe what they should exhibit, but of the true  
 “ Saints of God, the undefiled and virgin souls who  
 “ follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth ? Such  
 “ is the difference between those whom Christ praises  
 “ and those whom He condemns or warns. The Pha-  
 “ risee recounted the signs of God’s mercy upon and  
 “ in him ; the Publican simply looked to God. The  
 “ young Ruler boasted of his correct life, but the  
 “ penitent woman anointed Jesus’ feet and kissed  
 “ them ; nay, holy Martha herself, spoke of her  
 “ ‘ much service ;’ while Mary waited on Him for  
 “ the ‘ one thing needful.’ The one thought of them-

<sup>1</sup> Lect. 13. “ On Preaching the Gospel,” p. 388.

“selves ; the others thought of Christ. To look at  
 “Christ is to be justified by faith ; to think of being  
 “justified by faith is to look from Christ and to fall  
 “from grace. He who worships Christ and works  
 “for Him is acting that doctrine which another does  
 “but enunciate ; his worship and his works are acts  
 “of faith, and avail to his salvation, because he does  
 “not do them *as* availing.”

#### Art. XVI. *Of sin after Baptism.*

From this difference in the view of Justification, it could not be, but that there should be a material difference as to the view of sin after Baptism. And the charges on this subject relate simply to myself. Some, I believe, have gone so far as to imply that I contravene the Article, although I prefaced what I said with a statement in its very words ; others allege only that my statements interfere, according to their view, with the doctrine of justification by faith. And this could not be otherwise. For in that they sever Justification from Baptism, and make it to consist in the “*act* of reliance upon the merits of CHRIST only,” sin, according to them, is forgiven, *at once*, upon each renewal of this act : and in that they thus virtually substitute this act for Baptism, a man has thereupon no more to do with his past sins, than, according to the doctrine of the Church, he has with those remitted by Baptism. Since, moreover, they identify this act with Justification, then a man’s justification is renewed, so often as this act is renewed :

and if any one denies that a man is *forthwith* completely justified, it is, with them, all one with denying that he is "justified by faith only." I say this, by way of explaining how one who takes this view of justification must, if he judge another by his principles, do him injustice unintentionally ; he cannot understand how our own merits and deservings are not introduced into the act of justification. On the other hand, according to our Church, we are by Baptism brought into a state of salvation, or justification (for the words are thus far equivalent), a state into which we were brought of God's free mercy alone, without works, but in which having been placed, we are to "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling," through the indwelling Spirit of "God, working in us to will and to do of His good pleasure ;" a *state* admitting of degrees, according to the degree of sanctification ; (although the first *act*, whereby we were brought into it, did not) a state admitting of relapses and recoveries, but which is weakened by every relapse ; injured by lesser, destroyed for the time by grievous, sin ; and after such sin recovered with difficulty, in proportion to the greatness of the sin, and the degree of its wilfulness, and of the grace withstood.

Now all this does not lie within the scope of the Article ; the Article expressly condemns persons holding two opposite errors, "those which say they can no more sin as long as they live here," and "those who deny the place of forgiveness to such as



*truly* repent." But who "*truly* repent;" what are helps towards *true* repentance; when a man, who has been guilty of "deadly sin wilfully committed after Baptism," may be satisfied that he is truly repentant for it; whether and to what degree he should, all his life after, continue his repentance for it; whether he be altogether pardoned, or whether only so long as he continue in a state of penitence; wherein his penitence should consist; whether continued repentance would efface the traces of his sin in himself; whether he might ever in this life look upon himself as restored to the state in which he had been, had he not committed it; whether it affect the degree of his future bliss, or its effects be effaced by his repentance, but their extinction depend upon the continued greatness of his repentance: whether cessation of his active repentance may not bring back degrees of the sin upon him; whether it shall appear again in the day of judgment; these, and the like, are questions upon which the Article does not speak, but upon which a modern popular theology has decided very peremptorily, and will have no interference with its decrees. According to it, the whole office of repentance is to bring men to CHRIST, the terrors of the law are to drive men to dread the punishment due to their sins, to renounce them, to seek for reconciliation through the free mercy of CHRIST; and so far is, of course, true; but when men have thus been brought to "lay hold of His saving merits," then, according to them, their sins

are done away ; they “are covered<sup>1</sup> ;” they can appear no more ; “the handwriting is blotted out ;” a man has no more to do with them than to thank CHRIST that he has been delivered from them. This “apprehension of Christ’s merits” is to them instead of Baptism, a full remission of sins, completely effacing them ; and so often as any man embraces those merits, so often, according to them, are his sins effaced. To revert to past sin, is to doubt of CHRIST’S mercy ; to bear a painful recollection of it, is to be under the bondage of the law ; to seek to efface it by repentance, is weakness of faith ; to do acts of mercy, or self-denial, or self-abasement, or to fast, with reference to it, is to interfere with the “freeness and fulness of the Gospel ;” to insist upon them, is “to place repentance in stead of Christ.” This system has but two topics, “repent, and believe the Gospel ;” and so far right ; but these two so narrowed, that repentance is to precede faith, faith to supersede repentance. Other offices of repentance, it scarcely entertains in thought, except to denounce or to scoff at<sup>2</sup>.

It was against this system, my Lord, that I spoke : this abuse of the doctrine of justification by faith is searing men’s consciences now, as much as the “indulgences” of the Romish system did before. It used to be said that “the Romish was an easy

<sup>1</sup> Ps. xxxii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *E. g.* in the way in which certain acts of self-discipline instanced from Bp. Taylor, in Tract 66, p. 8, have been jeered at.

religion to die in ;” but even the Romish, in its corruptions, scarcely offered terms so easy, at all events made not a boast of the easiness of its terms ; if it had but the dregs of the system of the ancient Church, stale and unprofitable as these often were, they had yet something of the strength or the bitterness of the ancient medicine : they, at least, testified to a system, when men made sacrifices for the good of their souls, humbled themselves in dust and ashes ; practised self-discipline ; “ accused<sup>1</sup> and condemned “ themselves, that so they might find mercy at their “ heavenly Father’s hand for Christ’s sake, and not “ be accused and condemned in that fearful judgment ;” felt “ the remembrance” of their past sins to be “ grievous<sup>2</sup> unto” them, “ the burthen” to be “ intolerable ;” “ were grieved and wearied with the burthen of their sins ;” “ turned<sup>3</sup> to God in weeping fasting and praying ;” “ bewailed<sup>3</sup> and lamented their “ sinful life, acknowledged and confessed their offences, and sought to bring forth worthy fruits of “ penance ;” and in cases of notorious sin, were “ put<sup>3</sup> “ to open penance, and punished in this world that “ their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord.” The sun of the ancient Church was setting, sadly obscured by the mists and vapours of earth which had gathered round it ; yet it did occasionally gleam through on the eye, which watched constantly for it

<sup>1</sup> Visitation of the Sick.

<sup>2</sup> Communion Service.

<sup>3</sup> Communion Service.

behind those mists; and even to these clouds which half hid it, it imparted oftentimes its own, though a melancholy, lustre. Romanism was, in practice as well as in doctrine, decayed; yet to those who "loved the stones and pitied the dust" of the ancient city of God, its very ruins marked the outline, which they might trace out for themselves: treasures were buried there for those, who would clear away the heaps, which decay accumulated over them. To the many, her's was a debasing system, yet there might be, and was often, reality in it, to those who would find it.

The refined distinctions, which she made in carrying out her divisions of mortal and venial sins; her accurate allotment of punishments, (as if she could measure out the degree of guilt contracted by each offence against God); her inventions of attrition and contrition; the assumption of an absolute power to remit altogether venial, and the eternal consequences of mortal sins; not to speak now of the sale <sup>1</sup> of indulgences or the commutation of penance for money; these favoured the corruptions of carnal men <sup>2</sup>, stifled

<sup>1</sup> The *sale* of indulgences was prohibited by the Council of Trent (Sess. xxi. c. 9. de reformat.) "that all might *at length* truly understand that these heavenly treasures of the Church were employed not for gain but for piety," and the extent of previous corruptions admitted; their use, as a means of power, is continued. See quotations in Mr. Newman, on Romanism, Lect. 4. "Doctrine of Infallibility politically considered," p. 145. ed. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See more fully Newman on Romanism, Lect. 3. "Doctrine of Infallibility morally considered," p. 113, sqq. ed. 2.



the misgivings which might awaken them from their security, lowered the tone and standard, whereat they were to aim, and threw them on the Church, to whom the dispensation of those treasures of mercy were committed, rather than on Him, in whose name she dispensed them. She took upon herself the office of the Judge, anticipated His sentence, and stood in His place. Such were the effects of her portion of it, its corruptions; but insomuch as she retained from Antiquity, the system bore witness to the holiness of God; the grievousness of offending Him; the “earnestness, indignation, fear, vehement longing, zeal, revenge,” which the Apostle <sup>1</sup> says “godly sorrow worketh;” it spoke of holier times and holier practices than it realized or encouraged, to those who had ears to hear. But this modern system, whose very boast it is to make works of no account <sup>2</sup>; which teaches people, on their deathbed, after a life of profligacy and infamy, servants of sin and Satan, destroying, as far as in them lay, the souls of others, to put away all painful remembrance of past sin, and to exult and triumph in having cast away “their righteousnesses” (which they had not) “like filthy rags,”

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. vii. 10, 11.

<sup>2</sup> Thus a very popular and in many respects valuable account of the destruction of a vessel, speaking of the apparent conversion of some, under the immediate prospect of sudden death, appealed strongly to this proof of the value of faith without works. “What,” it said, “would they have done, who make salvation depend in any degree upon works in such a case, when there was no time to perform them?”

and to joy as though they had “fought the good fight,” and been approved soldiers; which would make it, practically easier, and safer almost, to be saved without works than with them, speaking often of the danger of relying upon works, and but little of the danger of being lost for want of them; which stifles continually the strong emotions of terror and amazement which GOD has wrought upon the soul, and “healing slightly the wound” which He has made, makes it often incurable; which makes peace rather than holiness, the end of its ministrations, and by an artificial wrought-up peace, checks the deep and searching agony, whereby GOD, as in a furnace of fire, was purifying the whole man, “by the Spirit of judgment, and by the Spirit of burning”—this is altogether a spurious system, misapplying the promises of the Gospel, usurping the privileges of Baptism, which it has not to confer, giving peace which it has not to bestow, and going counter to the whole tenor of Scripture, “that every man shall be judged according to his works.”

This system, however it differs from Romanism in the means, agrees with it in the end, in lulling the conscience, ridding man (as he craves to be,) of all anxieties as to his past life, permitting him to forget his past sins; and that, without exercising the self-discipline, which Romanism, when not altogether corrupt, still encourages.

Our Church, my Lord, here as elsewhere, appears to me to hold a distinct line, however she has not

been able as yet to revive the "godly discipline" which she feelingly deploras. Romanism, as well as Ultra-Protestantism, practically frees a man from his past sins; our Church bids him confess that he is "tied<sup>1</sup> and bound with the chain" of them, and to pray Him that "the pitifulness of His great mercy may loose us;" she teaches us, in her daily service, to have our "sins *ever* before us" that so GOD may "hide His face from our sins, and blot out all our iniquities;" she bids us come day by day with "broken and contrite hearts" which GOD "will not despise;" to "rend our hearts" that "GOD may repent Him of the evil;" to seek of GOD "correction," though "with judgment, not in His anger;" to go daily to our Father, and say unto Him that we are "no more worthy to be called His sons." She teaches us daily to confess all the sins of our past life; all our past "erring and straying," our *having* "offended against His holy laws," *having* "left undone, what we ought to have done, and done what we ought not to have done;" three times a week she teaches us to pray to be delivered "from His wrath and from everlasting damnation," and "in the day of judgment;" that He would give us "true repentance, forgive us *all* our sins, negligences, and ignorances." And in her most solemn service, she would have us approach with "true penitent hearts;" still gathering before our eyes, all the sins of our past lives, that

<sup>1</sup> This prayer was objected to by the Puritans, and consistently with their system. Their objection shows the more how much of doctrine is contained in our ancient prayers, that they do breathe a different moral spirit.

“ the remembrance of them ” being “ grievous unto us, and the burthen of them intolerable,” we may bring them all before Him, pray Him, “ for JESUS CHRIST’s sake to forgive us *all* that is past.”

In the solemn service, again, with which this season has just begun, she “ admonishes us of the *great* indignation of God against sinners,” that “ we may the rather be moved to *earnest* and true repentance ;” and then, after most deep confession of sins, gives us not peace herself, but prays, in the words which He placed in the mouths of His priests to bless, “ the Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon us and give us peace.” She guides us from herself, either preaching or blessing, to Him who is “ the merciful receiver of all true penitent sinners,” and to His untold, unfathomable, mercies in CHRIST JESUS ; she would have us continually lean on His mercy, not as confident that our sins were already blotted out, but rather as beholding ourselves “ full of ” all “ the sores ” which by our past sins, we had inflicted upon our souls, yet trusting that His mercy will yet be greater than our sins, striving to cleanse ourselves, yet awaiting to the end His gracious sentence, whereby He shall say “ I will, be thou clean,” and “ deliver us from the extreme “ malediction which shall light upon them that shall “ be set on the left hand, and set us on His right “ hand, and give us the gracious benediction of His “ Father, commanding us to take possession of His “ glorious kingdom.” And so she continues even to the end ; she exhorts us *all* twice every day, after her



Absolution, to beseech God to “grant us true repentance”—a truer and deeper repentance than we have;—prays for it in the Litany, in connection with our *past* “sins, negligences, and ignorances;” prays again throughout Lent that (what a modern system looks upon as taking place once only in life) “God “would *create* and make in us *new* and contrite “[broken] *hearts*; that we *worthily* lamenting our “sins and acknowledging our wretchedness,” &c. and thus, to the verge of the grave, or whenever sickness brings death and judgment in nearer sight, she not only exhorts *all* “truly to repent,” but prays for them that “the sense of their weakness may add “strength to their faith, and *seriousness* to their repentance.” She would have both deepened in us to our last breath, that we may in penitent trust close our eyes and approach the Judge of all—with the words of that great example of humble repentance and exceeding faith, “Lord, remember me when “Thou comest into Thy kingdom.” The very titles with which she accompanies the name of repentance show how deep and earnest her views of repentance are; she never names it without some word to express its reality. Thus she speaks again and again of “*true* repentance <sup>1</sup>,” “and *seriousness* to repentance <sup>2</sup>,” “*unfeigned* repentance <sup>2</sup>,” “*earnest* and true repent-

<sup>1</sup> Twice in the Daily Absolution, in Visitation of the Sick (where it occurs three times, being omitted in the prayers for persons troubled in mind or in conscience); Litany; Communion Service, twice.

<sup>2</sup> Visitation of the Sick.

ance<sup>1</sup>;" "with *all* contrition<sup>1</sup>;" "*faithful* repentance<sup>1</sup>;" and in her service of most solemn joy, the Communion of her Lord, she comes most broken-hearted; she has there her deepest confession of guilt, and there she most accumulates these titles. Its unspeakable blessings she sets forth, having first said "if with "a *true* penitent heart—we receive that Holy Sacrament: for *then*," &c.; then she exhorts us, "repent "you *truly* of your sins past—so shall ye be made "partakers," &c.; then placing that confession in our mouths, she invites us with the words, "Ye that do *truly* and *earnestly* repent you of your sins;" then pronounces her absolution upon us, as such as "with *heartly* repentance turn unto Him:" so that her address "Hear what comfortable words our Saviour "Christ saith unto all that *truly* turn to Him: 'Come "unto Me, all ye that travail, and are heavy laden, "and I will refresh you,'" sounds indeed most comfortably. Her sense of the awful privileges of the Communion, and her own manifold unworthiness, and deep expressions of repentance<sup>2</sup>, harmonize truly together: modern systems would have had neither.

This appears to me then the characteristic difference of the three systems; Romanism as well as Ultra-Protestantism would consult readily for man's

<sup>1</sup> Commination Service.

<sup>2</sup> Much instruction on the repentant character of our Liturgy, will be found in a Tract now being published, No. 86. "On the Indications of a Superintending Providence in the preservation of the Liturgy, and the changes which it has undergone."

feverish anxiety to be altogether at ease; our Church sets him in the way in which GOD's peace may descend upon him, but forestalls not His sentence. She has no second Baptism to give, and so she cannot pronounce him altogether free from his past sins. There are but two periods of *absolute* cleansing, Baptism and the day of judgment. She therefore teaches him continually to repent, that so his sins *may be* blotted out, though she has no commission to tell him absolutely that they *are*; she repeats to him his LORD's words, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy-laden, and *I* will give you rest," and so sends him to her LORD that he may "find rest for his soul," but does not anticipate His gracious act; she absolves him, "if he earnestly and heartily desire it," "by His authority committed unto" her, and then, (even while holding out her most solemn form of Absolution, as a means of relieving the troubled conscience,) she confesses the incompleteness of her own act, in that she subjoins a prayer for pardon of those sins, from which she had just absolved him; "O most merciful God, who dost so put away the sins of those who truly repent, that Thou rememberest them no more; Open Thine eye of mercy upon this Thy servant, who most earnestly desireth pardon and forgiveness; impute not unto him his former sins." The very renewal of her Eucharistic absolution "pardon and deliver you from *all* your sins," attests that she does not hold them to have been all absolutely remitted; but thus she sets him in a way

whereby he may obtain peace; she bids him repent, sorrow, sue for pardon, not forget his repentance, come to Him who can and will give rest, pronounces over him His Absolution, invites him where "his sinful body may be made clean by His Body, and His soul washed through His most precious Blood," blesses him with His blessing, "the Peace of God which passeth all understanding," and so dismisses him, bearing with him, as she hopes, His peace, Who Alone is "the Author of Peace," Whose alone it is to bestow it. And this is altogether in accordance with Scripture, which uniformly speaks of "peace" as the *direct* gift of God. "Grace be unto you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ," is the standing<sup>1</sup> Apostolic salutation to the Church; and thence is the Church's blessing<sup>2</sup>, "The Peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds;" so again<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is used by St. Paul, with a very slight variation in all his Epistles; in Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; Eph. i. 2; Phil. i. 2; Col. i. 2; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 2; Phil. 3: "Grace be unto you and peace from God *our* Father and the Lord Jesus Christ;" in Gal. i. 3. it is "from God *the* Father;" &c.; in 1 Tim. i. 2. "Grace, mercy and peace from God *our* Father;" 2 Tim. i. 2. "*the* Father;" Tit. i. 3. "the Lord Jesus Christ the Saviour;" St. Peter uses a similar salutation, 2 Pet. i. 2. "Grace and peace *be multiplied* unto you through the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord:" and St. John, writing to an individual, (2 Epist. 3.) the same as that of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, but adding "the Son of the Father in truth and love."

<sup>2</sup> Phil. iv. 7.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Thess. iii. 16.



“the Lord of peace give you peace always;” “My<sup>1</sup> peace I give unto you;” “the God<sup>2</sup> of hope fill you with all peace and joy in believing;” “The fruit<sup>3</sup> of the Spirit is love, joy, peace;” GOD is the “God of Peace,” our LORD “is our peace<sup>4</sup>,” nor is peace spoken of any where as coming from any other source but directly from Him.

The difference then between the views in question is not, as to the hope of pardon to the penitent, not even as to the prospect of peace in this world; but as to what is penitence, and how that peace is to be obtained; whether from men’s declarations, or directly from GOD; whether at first or at last, whenever it pleases GOD to send it; whether amid forgetfulness of past sin, or while recalling it in bitterness of recollection and praying God for His Son’s sake to pardon it; whether amid continual humiliation which saith “God be merciful to me a sinner,” or amid exultation at being free from self-righteousness. As repentance is GOD’s gift, and GOD’s work in a man’s soul, so is there obviously great danger in interfering with it; “He woundeth” and He must “heal;” He “killeth” and He must “make alive;” He “bringeth down to the grave and bringeth up.” They must have had but little acquaintance with wounded consciences, who know not how terribly He does “chasten man for sin, making his beauty to consume away,” how “He writeth bitter things

<sup>1</sup> John xiv. 27.    <sup>2</sup> Rom. xv. 13.    <sup>3</sup> Gal. v. 22.    <sup>4</sup> Eph. ii. 14.

against him, and maketh him to possess his former iniquities ;” and in this awfulness of His chastisements, which we very often cannot mitigate, though we would, He bids us beware how we interfere with His work in the soul, or apply lenitives, when He is probing the diseased and ulcerous part “to the very dividing of the soul and body.” These false kindnesses, (which in one body of Christians, now daily parting more from the Church, is become systematic,) are continually marring the work, which GOD had with a healthful severity begun. The penitent, untimely delivered from his distress, loses the energy of repentance, and the hatred of sin, which GOD was annealing into his soul, and becomes a common-place and a sickly Christian. What I would urge then, is to hold out the prospect of peace, but as GOD’s gift through the deepening of repentance; not to cut short His work, whether by the Sacrament of penance, or inward persuasions, or misapplied promises of the Gospel; but to direct to His mercies in CHRIST; and He, who “knoweth whereof we are made, and remembereth that we are but dust,” will have pity on them, “as a father pitieth his own children,” when they have learnt to “fear Him.” Not peace, but salvation is our end; but peace also He, the GOD of peace, will bestow, as He sees most healthful for them, according to the evenness and consistency of their course; clouding it, if they are remiss or halting; renewing it, when they humble themselves and press onward; and in all cases bestowing upon us more than we deserve, for His sake “Who is our Peace.”

Art. XXV. *On the Sacraments.*

On the Sacraments, two sets of charges are brought; one, that we unduly exalt the Sacraments of our LORD; the other, that we are not disinclined to ascribe a sacramental character to other rites which the Church of Rome has defined to be Sacraments in the same sense as Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. And these two charges have naturally gone together; for in the school of Calvin and Zuingli, the two great Sacraments have been so lowered, that they who have learned therein, would speak of them in language scarcely so high as we should of rites, which are not "Sacraments of the Gospel." We must then to them appear both to ascribe to these rites, the character of Sacraments, as they conceive of Sacraments, and to exalt the true Sacraments to something higher.

To speak first of that portion of that charge, which relates to Sacraments generally. The caution of our Church on this subject is very remarkable; she nowhere denies that there are more than two Sacraments, *in some sense of the word*; nay, in the Articles, Catechism, and Homilies alike, she implies or asserts that there are more; in the Articles she denies only that "those five commonly called Sacraments—are to be counted for *Sacraments of the Gospel*, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are *states of life allowed in the Scriptures*, but yet have not the

“ *like nature of Sacraments with Baptism* and the “ Lord’s Supper :” for in that she says that they “ have not the *like nature* of Sacraments” with the two great Sacraments, she rather implies that some of them have *some* sacramental character, though not “ like” to those two. In like manner, when, in her Catechism she teaches her children, that there are “ two Sacraments, only, ordained by Christ in His “ Church, generally, [i.e. universally,] necessary to salvation,” she implies that there are other rites which might have the name, though not of this high dignity, nor “ universally necessary” nor “ ordained by Christ Himself.” And precisely this distinction is made in the Homilies, which recognize several “ sacraments” in that larger sense, at the very time that, and in the same language as the Articles, they distinguish between them, and the two great Sacraments. “ As<sup>1</sup> “ for the number of them [the Sacraments], if they “ should be considered according to the *exact signi-* “ *fication of a Sacrament*, namely for visible signs, expressly commanded in the New Testament, where- “ unto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of “ sins, and of our holiness *and joining in Christ*, there “ be but two ; namely Baptism and the Supper of “ the Lord. For although Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sins, yet by the express word “ of the New Testament, it hath not this promise “ *annexed and tied to the visible sign*, which is imposi-

<sup>1</sup> Of Common Prayer and Sacraments.



“ tion of hands. For this visible sign, (I mean lay-  
 “ ing on of hands,) is not expressly commanded in  
 “ the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as  
 “ the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord’s Supper  
 “ are; and therefore Absolution is *no such Sacrament*  
 “ *as Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are*, and though  
 “ the ordering of ministers hath this visible sign and  
 “ promise, yet it lacks the promise of remission of  
 “ sin, *as all other Sacraments besides the above named*  
 “ *do*. Therefore neither it, *nor any other Sacrament*  
 “ *else, be such Sacraments* as Baptism and the Com-  
 “ munion are. But in a general acception, the name  
 “ of a Sacrament may be attributed to any thing;  
 “ whereby an holy thing is signified. In which un-  
 “ derstanding of the word, the ancient writers have  
 “ given this name not only to the other five, com-  
 “ monly of late years taken and used for supplying  
 “ the number of the seven Sacraments, but also to  
 “ divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil,  
 “ washing of feet, and such like; not meaning thereby  
 “ to repute them as Sacraments, *in the same significa-*  
 “ *tion* that the two fore-named Sacraments are. And  
 “ therefore St. Augustine, weighing the true signifi-  
 “ cation and *exact meaning* of the word, writing to  
 “ Januarius, and also in the third book of Christian  
 “ doctrine, affirmeth that the ‘Sacraments of Chris-  
 “ tians, as they are most excellent in signification, so  
 “ are they most few in number;’ and in both places  
 “ maketh mention expressly of two, the Sacrament  
 “ of Baptism and the Supper of the LORD. And

“ although they are retained by the order of the  
 “ Church of England, besides these two, certain  
 “ other rites and ceremonies about the institution of  
 “ ministers in the Church, Matrimony, Confirmation  
 “ of children by examining them of their knowledge  
 “ of the articles of faith, and joining thereto the  
 “ prayers of the Church for them, and likewise for  
 “ the Visitation of the sick; yet no man ought to  
 “ take these for Sacraments, *in such signification and*  
 “ *meaning*, as the Sacraments of Baptism and the  
 “ Lord’s Supper are; but either for godly states of  
 “ life, necessary in Christ’s Church, and therefore  
 “ worthy to be set forth by public action and so-  
 “ lemnity, by the ministry of the Church, or else  
 “ judged to be such ordinances, as may make for the  
 “ instruction, comfort, and edification of Christ’s  
 “ Church.”

This passage is very remarkable for the principles which it contains, and the caution with which it is expressed; and that, the more, since the object of the writer, as well as of the Article, was to guard against an over-, rather than an under- value of these secondary Sacraments, or Sacramentals<sup>1</sup>: he had then to protest against Romanist error, not against a profane indifference to sacred rites; and yet he not only

<sup>1</sup> The word “Sacramentals” is used by Beza, (quoted Hooker, E. P. IV. i. 4. ed. Keble) to designate “any ceremony importing signification of Spiritual things;” the introduction of any such into the Church of God, he declares to be a “right grievous sin;” yet, remarkably enough, as Hooker observes, the title “as sacraments”

altogether shrinks from denying that sacred rites may be termed "sacraments," but expressly calls them so, only laying down that they are "not *such* Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are," agreeing herein altogether with the Fathers. The modern school may apologize for, or elude the passage, but they clearly would not themselves have so written. (2) He does not even deny that some of those which are not, in the highest sense, "sacraments," have a spiritual gift conveyed in connection with them. On the contrary, of Absolution he expressly says, that "it hath the promise of forgiveness of sins," only "not annexed to the visible sign," and is thereby distinguished from the great Sacraments. So, again, Orders he allows to have both "the visible sign and promise," *i. e.* of spiritual grace; but not "remission of sins," and thus it also is distinguished from the proper Sacraments. And this coincides with our Ordination Service; for the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," had been a manifest impiety, unless the act of Ordination were, to those worthily receiving it, accompanied with the gift of the Holy Spirit; as indeed it is expressly affirmed by Holy Scripture, that an *inward* "gift" was bestowed upon Timothy through his ordination, "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands, with the lay-

which Hooker adopts (*l. c.*) is used by the same writers, who entitle "the Apostles' imposition of hands" "a sign, or as it were sacrament."

“ing on of the hands of the presbytery<sup>1</sup>.” So further, he says in general of “other sacraments,” that they “*all* lack the promise of remission of sins;” implying at the same time, that there are others, which he would call sacraments (as Matrimony is expressly termed in another homily<sup>2</sup>), and that what at once distinguished them from the great Sacraments was, that they conveyed no “remission of sins;” whereby he virtually allows that they did convey spiritual grace. And so, probably, he meant that such rites, as did not “grow of the corrupt following of the Apostles” (Art. XXV.) had such spiritual grace; nor indeed does it appear how a sacred action, which is really a type or image of a sacred thing (which is his definition) should be destitute of spiritual influences. Such is also the teaching of later Divines of chief note in the Church. Thus Hooker vindicates against the Puritans, the spiritual graces of Confirmation, with an appeal to the universal teaching of the ancient Church. “The Fathers every where impute unto “it that gift or grace of the Holy Ghost, not which “maketh us Christian men, but, when we are made “such, assisteth us in all virtue, armeth us against “temptation and sin.”—“The Fathers therefore, being “thus persuaded, held confirmation as an ordinance “Apostolic, *always profitable* in God’s Church, al-

<sup>1</sup> 2 Tim. i. 6. 1 Tim. iv. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Sermon on Swearing, pt. i. See other authorities among later English Divines in Palmer on the Church, pt. 6. c. 8. t. 2. p. 442.



“ though not always accompanied with equal largeness of those external effects, which gave it countenance at the first.”—“ By which answer [of St. Jerome] it appeareth that his opinion was, that the Holy Ghost is received in Baptism: that confirmation is only a *sacramental complement*.” “ Now what effect their imposition of hands hath, either after Baptism administered by heretics, or otherwise, St. Jerome in that place hath made no mention, because all men understood that in converts it tendeth to the fruits of repentance, and craveth in behalf of the penitent such grace as David after his fall desired at the hands of God; in others, the fruit and benefit is that which hath been before shewn.”—“ Whereunto [to the fatherly encouragement and exhortation of the Bishops] imposition of hands and prayer being added, our warrant for the great good effect thereof is the same which Patriarchs, Prophets, Priests, Apostles, Fathers, and men of God, have had for such their particular invocations and benedictions, as no man, I suppose, professing truth of religion will easily think to have been without fruit<sup>1</sup>.”

Not less remarkable, on the other side, is the light which this comparison throws upon the views of the writer of the Homily, as to the two great Sacraments. He does not indeed rest the question of the number of proper sacraments, solely on the ex-

<sup>1</sup> Eccl. Pol. V. 66. § 4. 6. 7.

ternal distinctions, but goes also to the good ground of Christian Antiquity; and asserts them to be distinct, because the Ancient Church ever so distinguished them. But besides this ground, he also, in the same way as the Articles and Catechism, alleges the peculiar dignity cast around the two proper Sacraments, in that in them nothing was left to be supplied by man; every thing in them was ordained by our LORD Himself; the visible sign, as well as the promise of the invisible grace, and the promised connexion between the two: so that although the one or other rite come near to have the character of a Sacrament, yet it falls short in that it is not equally guarded. Thus he points out that Absolution "hath the promise of forgiveness of sins," but not the connexion with the visible sign; Ordination hath *a* promise and the visible sign, but not *the promise* which the others have. And this distinctive promise is, union with our LORD, and consequent justification and sanctification; for so he expressly says, the "*exact*" definition of a sacrament is a visible sign, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is "*annexed* the promise of *forgiveness* of our sins and of our *holiness* and *joining in Christ*." Other rites may be and are means of grace, but no other than the Sacraments of our LORD are means of direct union with Him. And this union, justification, sanctification, are according to this clear and distinct writer, not merely concomitants, accompanying the right use of the Sacrament, but they are (he uses the very

phrase to which the Ultra-Protestant theories from his day to our's most object) "*annexed and tied to the visible sign*;" for the absence of such annexation he alleges as the ground why Absolution is not to be regarded as a Sacrament; again coinciding with the language of the Catechism, that "they are the means, whereby we receive the inward and spiritual grace;" they are not only pledges to assure our faith; much less *mere* outward signs of what is worked inwardly, but means and channels whereby God conveys it.

Thus then this passage of the Homily conveys throughout precisely the view as to the distinction between the true, proper Sacraments, and those rites which in some respects approximate to Sacraments, and the grounds of that distinction, which are now stigmatized as Papistical. I need only adduce one passage, in which this distinction has of late been very clearly stated<sup>1</sup>.

"If justification be the inward application of the Atonement, we are furnished at once with a sufficient definition of a sacrament for the use of our Church. The Romanist considers that there are seven; we do not strictly determine the number. We define the word generally to be an 'outward sign of an inward grace,' without saying to how many ordinances this applies. However, what we do determine is, that Christ has ordained two special Sacraments, as *generally necessary to salvation*.

<sup>1</sup> Newman on Justification, Lect. 6. "On the gift of Righteousness," v. fin. p. 169, 70.

“ This, then, is the characteristic mark of those two, “ separating them from all other whatever ; and what “ is this but saying in other words that they are the “ only *justifying* rites, or instruments of communi- “ eating the Atonement, which *is* the one thing “ necessary to us ? Ordination, for instance, gives “ *power*, yet without making the soul acceptable to “ God ; Confirmation gives light and strength, yet is “ the mere completion of Baptism ; and Absolution “ is a negative ordinance removing the barrier which “ sin has raised between us and that grace, which by “ inheritance is our’s. But the two Sacraments ‘ of “ the Gospel,’ are the instruments of inward life, “ according to our Lord’s declaration, that Baptism “ is a new *birth*, and that in the Eucharist we eat the “ *living* Bread.”

Now this distinction, which, with the Homily, we have made, the Romanist will not make ; for it would be conceding the whole question, were he to allow that two of his seven Sacraments were completely *sui generis*, so as wholly to be above, and removed from, the other five. The rest would be a question of words and names only. On the contrary, the Council of Trent, where it anathematizes any who should say, that, “ these <sup>1</sup> seven Sacraments “ are in such wise equal among themselves, that one “ is in no respect superior to the other,” meant, as Card. Bellarmine<sup>2</sup> explains it, to condemn those

<sup>1</sup> Sess. 7. can. 3.

<sup>2</sup> De Sacram. L. 2. c. 28.



who ascribe to Baptism the same dignity as the Eucharist; and he is very indignant with those impugnors of the Council, who said that they observed this Canon, in that they did separate Baptism and the Eucharist from the rest, regarding the former as the institutions of CHRIST, the rest, as the inventions of men. "This," he says, "is to blink the question," for that first, the Council assumed that all seven are Sacraments of the New Law; secondly, that the object was to condemn a further error of the Lutherans, who regarded Baptism as of equal dignity with the Eucharist; thirdly, "the Council itself asserted the Eucharist to excel all the other Sacraments<sup>1</sup>, but "did not make this comparison as to the others." Further it is part of the Romanist system to inculcate that each of their Sacraments has not only something peculiar, but some superiority over the rest; that so there should result a sort of balance of dignity between them, and none, except the Eucharist, should be placed above the rest, so as to introduce any essential or practical disparity between them. And thus they guard their number seven: since though they cannot but admit that Baptism has some especial prerogatives over other of their Sacraments, so they contend, have others; so that this is to be no sufficient ground for distinguishing them. Thus Card. Bellarmine alleges, that "Baptism<sup>2</sup> excels "as to the effect of remitting sin, in that it remits

<sup>1</sup> Sess. 12. cap. 3.

<sup>2</sup> L. c.

“ original sin, and actual sins with all the punishment  
 “ due to them, which other Sacraments do not ;  
 “ Confirmation excels as to the effect of grace toward  
 “ good-doing, for it presupposes the effect of Baptism,  
 “ and superadds more abundant grace ; the Eucha-  
 “ rist excels all, as to the substance of the Sacra-  
 “ ment—as having not only an operative power, but  
 “ containing truly Christ Himself the Author of that  
 “ power ; Penance excels all in necessity, except  
 “ Baptism, with which it has this excellence in com-  
 “ mon ; Extreme Unction in a manner excels Pe-  
 “ nance, as to the effect of grace, like as Confirmation  
 “ excels Baptism, for it presupposes the whole effect  
 “ of Penance, and adds more abundant grace, which  
 “ can not only wipe away all sins, if present, but  
 “ remove the very traces of sin ; Orders excels all,  
 “ except Confirmation, as to the minister, in that it  
 “ can be conferred by a Bishop only ; nay, herein it  
 “ seems to excel Confirmation ; since Confirmation,  
 “ sometimes, by dispensation, may be conferred by a  
 “ mere priest—also it excels the rest, in that it places  
 “ man in a higher grade than other Christians ;  
 “ lastly, Matrimony excels in signification ; for it  
 “ signifies the union of Christ with the Church,  
 “ whence it is called by the Apostle a ‘ great Sacra-  
 “ ment.’ ” No one can fail to see the object of these  
 ingenious and fine-drawn distinctions, (which were  
 held generally in the council of Trent itself<sup>1</sup>), nor

<sup>1</sup> “ All agree that if you regard the necessity and utility of the  
 “ Sacraments, Baptism ought to have the preference ; but Mar-

how presumptuously and wantonly Rome sacrifices the intrinsic greatness of one at least of the two great sacraments; nor the total difference of character between her distinctions, and those of the Homily and ourselves.

So then, this distinction between the “proper Sacraments” and “offices of the Church, to which there is allied a Sacramental efficacy,” so far from being one connected with Romanism, was of old adopted in our Church against Romanism; and when Romanists would distinguish between the efficacy of *their* Sacraments, they do it altogether in a different way; for a different end; and assuming that they are all in one respect equal, as being all “*proper Sacraments*.”

### *Baptism.*

A late Lutheran writer <sup>1</sup> admits that “as to the Sacrament of Baptism there is no controversy of much moment between the two Churches” [Lutheran and Romish]. It is then hardly worth while to enter into the question, what the Romish Church means by the “Character” impressed upon the baptized, and whether this may have a sound sense or no. There remains of course, one great difference between the two Churches, not peculiar to Baptism, but affect-

“riage, if you regard what it signifies; Confirmation, if you look to the dignity of the minister: and the Eucharist, if to the veneration due to it.” P. Sarpi, l. ii. c. 85.

<sup>1</sup> Marheineke Institt. Symbol. § 36.

ing much men's comfort and security, in receiving either Sacrament, that the "intention of the Priest to do what the Church does," is, according to Rome, requisite to make the Sacrament valid. A well-known instance in the late history of France of one who confessed on his death-bed, that he for years administered the Sacraments, meaning expressly "*not* to do what the Church did," illustrates at once the danger of such definitions, and the insecurity which this tenet, secured as it is by an anathema, must cast over those of the Romish Communion, whether they have indeed the Sacraments or no. "If any one say," are the words of Catharin, Bp. of Minori, in the Council of Trent <sup>1</sup>, "that these cases [of meaning to make the

<sup>1</sup> Sarpi, Hist. du Concil. de Trente, l. ii. c. 86. He was arguing that "the intention of the minister" required by the Council of Florence for the validity of a Sacrament, should be restrained to the "outward intention, whatever the inward purpose of the officiator might be;" in other words, that all which should be necessary to the validity of a Sacrament on the part of the Priest, should be an outward conformity with the rites of the Church. He urged, "supposing an internal intention necessary, then, if a Priest having the care of four or five thousand souls should be an unbeliever yet a great hypocrite, who, whether in the Baptism of Infants, or the absolution of penitents, or the consecration of the Eucharist, had the intention of not doing what the Church does, then it must be said that all the children were damned, the penitents unabsolved, and that none of the communicants had derived any benefit." "He insisted much," continues the historian, "on the affliction which an affectionate father would feel, if, seeing his child dying, he doubted the intention of the Priest who had baptized it; or, the disquiet of one who



“ administration of the Sacraments a jest] are rare,  
 “ would to God that in this corrupt age there were  
 “ not reason to think that they are very frequent !”

The very belief that there was a power to invalidate the Sacraments would be used by Satan as a temptation to make men essay to do so. Ultra-Protestants, strangely enough, come round to the same result of casting uncertainty on the efficacy of Baptism, in that they make it, in infants, to depend upon the faith of the parents, sponsors, congregation, or *Ministers*, not on “ CHRIST’s institution and promises, although they be ministered by evil men.” Art. XXVI. And whereas they would call it “ popish” to believe that an infant is, through the faith of the Church, which

“ received Baptism in an imperfect frame of mind, should he have  
 “ reason to suspect that the Priest who had baptized him, was a  
 “ false Christian, and that instead of intending to baptize or to con-  
 “ fess him, or to give him the Eucharist, he had meant only to  
 “ wash him in jest, and to make a sport of all the rest,” on which follow the terrible words quoted in the text. The decree of the Council finally was, “ if any one say that in ministers, when they  
 “ make and confer the Sacraments, there is not required at least  
 “ the intention of doing what the Church does, let him be ana-  
 “ thema.” Courayer says, that the mode in which Catharin explained the Council of Florence, was insensibly adopted in the schools as the explanation of that of Trent, though opposed in the Council itself, and though the Council seemed to require an internal intention on the part of the Minister. As far as it is adopted, it is a manifest evasion of the decree, “ on account,” as Courayer says, “ of the inconvenience resulting from its obvious sense.”

brings it unto CHRIST, accepted by Him, and regenerated by His Spirit, whatever be the character of the immediate human agents, they themselves coincide with the Romish error just stated<sup>1</sup>. The principle of St. Augustine, on the contrary, that children being able to put no bar of an opposite will, God's goodness flows unrestrained towards them, is, in our own Church, thus beautifully expressed by Hooker<sup>2</sup>; "He which with imposition of hands and prayer did "so great works of mercy for restoration of bodily "health, was worthily judged as able to effect the "infusion of heavenly grace into them whose age "was not yet depraved with that malice which might

<sup>1</sup> "Why leave two or three expressions in the Baptismal Service and her Catechism, so unguarded by explanation, as to induce many to imagine that every child is really regenerated in that ordinance, and made a true and living member of Christ, by a certain form of words, however, and *by whomsoever* (being a priest) pronounced, and even in spite of the unbelief or carelessness of all the parties concerned."—Essays on the Church, p. 269. Another ushers in, with an apology, a hypothetic case of a foxhunting clergyman, in illustration of the same point, (Fraser, p. 18). So with regard to the other Sacrament, it is used as part of an argument *ex absurdo*; "in infidel and debased Spain and Italy, our Lord's Body and Blood is constantly offered to the people, inasmuch as the priests who there officiate—*unbelievers as most of them* are—are yet the right line of Apostolic succession!"—Essays, p. 312. Yet what has the unbelief of the Priest to do with the privileges of the people? "does their unbelief make void the righteousness of God?"

<sup>2</sup> Eccl. Pol. V. 66. 1. ed. Keble.

“ be supposed a bar to the goodness of God towards  
 “ them. They brought Him therefore young children  
 “ to put his hands upon them and pray.”

In the same way again Archbishop Bramhall<sup>1</sup>:  
 “ Secondly, we distinguish between the visible sign,  
 “ and the invisible grace ; between the external sacra-  
 “ mental ablution, and the grace of the Sacrament,  
 “ that is, interior regeneration. We believe that  
 “ whosoever hath the former, hath the latter also, so  
 “ *that he do not put a bar against the efficacy of the*  
 “ *Sacrament by his infidelity or hypocrisy, of which a*  
 “ *child is not capable*, and therefore our very Liturgy  
 “ doth teach, that a child baptized, dying before the  
 “ commission of actual sin, is undoubtedly saved.”  
 And more recently, Waterland<sup>2</sup>: “ The second is  
 “ the case of infants. Their innocence and incapacity  
 “ are to them instead of repentance, which they do  
 “ not need, and of actual faith, which they cannot  
 “ have. They are capable of being savingly born of  
 “ water and the Spirit, and of being adopted into  
 “ sonship with what depends thereupon ; *because*  
 “ *though they bring no virtues with them, no positive*  
 “ *righteousness, yet they bring no obstacle, no impedi-*  
 “ *ment.*”

The modern school, which denies as “Popish” this

<sup>1</sup> Of persons dying without Baptism, Works, p. 979, quoted in Tracts, No. 76. Catena Patrum, No. 2. “Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration,” p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> On regeneration, 2, quoted ib. p. 46.

doctrine (and it is upon it that the question of the baptismal regeneration of all infants in fact turns), have apparently yet to learn that Christian Baptism is not that of the servant but of the LORD; that in the language of the Ancient Church "it is not man, but Christ, who baptizeth."

The chief charge against Rome as to the Sacrament of Baptism is, not that she has unduly exalted it, but, on the very contrary, that she has depreciated it. She insists indeed on its necessity, and there leaves it. This is the very coldest way, in which it could have been spoken of; she enlarges not on the gifts bestowed through it, on the Presence of our LORD thereat; on His communicating Himself to the soul, or His applying His own most precious Blood, thereby; or on the sacred Presence of the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and His thenceforth making the baptized His temple unless He be grieved away. These blessed truths she rather cast into the shade, though she would not deny them: in her anxiety to secure a *peculiar* Presence of our LORD in the Holy Eucharist, she rather conceals, and is unwilling to dwell on, His Sacred Presence in this Sacrament, whereby He makes us members of Himself: in her wish to vindicate the equality and dignity of her other Sacraments, as Sacraments, she is obliged to disguise that which constitutes the peculiar greatness of the two proper Sacraments,—the union with and Presence of our LORD,—and vindicates it to one only in a carnal way. The dignity also



which she ascribes to her Sacraments of Confirmation and Penance, leads her members the more away from looking to their Baptism: for Confirmation presupposes, as Bellarmine says, the gifts of Baptism, and adds more abundant grace, and so, "excels it as to the effect of grace for good-doing;" and when one sins among them, he is to look, not to God's mercies in Christ pledged to him in Baptism, and all the undefined and overflowing favour and loving-kindness involved in being made a member of the ever-Blessed Son, but to a distinct Sacrament of Penance. Thus, in both ways, her members are taught to look upon Baptism as a mere preliminary act, in the back-ground as it were, of the Christian life; the foreground, upon which their eye is fixed, being taken up by their Sacrament of Penance and the Holy Eucharist. It is, indeed, a remarkable instance of the effect of her whole system, even upon parts where she has not introduced error: it illustrates also mournfully the cancerous nature of error in any portion of revealed truth, how it spreads and preys upon the parts yet sound. As to Holy Baptism, Rome innovated not, and yet she has doubly lowered it; by a carnal glory which she would shed around the Holy Eucharist, and by the obstinacy, wherewith she would maintain the number of her seven Sacraments, and the human theories she had to resort to in order to uphold them. This indeed was the charge, brought by our early Controversialists against Rome,—that she depreciated the Sacrament of Baptism, to make way for her theory

respecting that of the Holy Eucharist; and so *they* would remedy her error on the latter, not in the modern way, by lowering both Sacraments, but by showing that Baptism had the same glorious privileges belonging to it, on which Rome would build up its carnal explanation of our LORD's presence in the Holy Eucharist. Thus Bp. Jewell<sup>1</sup>, "*Are we not partakers of the same Divine Substance in the Sacrament of Baptism?*" St. Augustine saith, 'By Baptism we are incorporate into Christ, and are made one Body with His Body.' Leo saith, 'The Body of him that is new born in Baptism, is made the flesh of Christ crucified,' that is to say, 'Flesh of His Flesh, and Bone of His Bone?' Yet nevertheless, the very substance of water remaineth still. Even so, notwithstanding we be made partakers of the Divine Substance of Christ, in the receiving of the holy Mysteries, yet the substance of bread therein remaineth still. And forasmuch as ye would prove by these words of St. Ambrose, that Christ is present in the Sacraments, the same St. Ambrose also saith, that Christ is *likewise present in the water of Baptism*. Thus he saith, &c." And in another place he explicitly brings this charge against the Romanists, "Forasmuch<sup>2</sup> as these two Sacraments being both of force alike, these men [the

<sup>1</sup> Defence of Apologie, p. 22. See also Replie to Harding, 285. and further references in "Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism," p. 179. sqq. ed. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Reply, p. 249, 50. quoted more at length. Ibid.

“Romanists] to advance their fantasies in the one, “by comparison so much abase the other, I think “it good, briefly and by the way, somewhat to touch “what the old Catholic Fathers have written of “God’s invisible workings in the Sacrament of Baptism. The Fathers in the Council of Nice say “thus:”

So then this school, while they think they have been opposing Romanist tendencies, have abandoned the strongest argument against them, and the most likely to recover them from their errors as to the Holy Eucharist.

But although in reality Rome has not, as to this Sacrament, admitted any positive statement, (at least none of any greater moment,) un-Catholic and un-Primitive, great and main points there are in the doctrine of Baptism, which by those who have followed an “extreme reformation,” have ever been accounted part of the corruptions of Popery. It was one of the objections of the Non-Conformists to our Liturgy, at the Savoy-Conference, and held to be “sinful,” that the Minister was “obliged to pronounce all baptized infants regenerate;” and modern Dissenters continue the charge<sup>1</sup>. Those, however, in our Church, who in this and other doctrinal points, have followed the teaching of the Non-Conformists, (since they cannot, as Ministers of the Church, blame the Liturgy,) throw the blame upon those who understand it as the

<sup>1</sup> See Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, p. 176, ed. 1.

Non-Conformists out of the Church, and the Bishops within it, at that time equally did. It is, indeed, not one of the least strange phenomena of the day, that a truth should be by newspapers and periodicals branded in members of the Church as a modern "heresy," which eighty years past, it is acknowledged, was held by almost every minister of the Church<sup>1</sup>, which is still held probably, at all events by all her Bishops; nay, that it should have been (until of late when the field has been widened) denominated as "*the Oxford heresy*," and placed as the head and front of our offending.

I own, my Lord, I have myself shrunk from stating fully the degree of evidence which there is, that Baptismal regeneration is the doctrine of the Church of England, lest in these days, when men hold so laxly by their Church, and are ready to quit her upon any ground of difference,—ready to suspect her, and very slow to suspect themselves,—the result of proving that Baptismal regeneration is the doctrine of our Church, would be that men would rather forsake their Church than embrace her doctrine. It seems to be looked upon as a first principle, that the duty of a Minister is to preach what he thinks the Gospel any how; and so if one discovers that he cannot consistently preach in the Church, he forthwith increases some old schism, or forms a new one, instead

<sup>1</sup> "Romaine states, that among the whole of the clergy, about 10,000 in number, of his time, there were not seven that preached the Gospel of Christ."—*Travels in Town*, t. ii. p. 105.



of remaining still, until he should see his way more clearly. Our schisms already threaten to make us a bye-word and a reproach, throughout the whole world; we carry our disgrace with us wherever we go; and are in danger of becoming a plague-spot to the Christian name, instead of being (as we might have been) one of the largest Communion, and the most flourishing of all collective Churches. The English nation is in the way to become the very type of schism. Rent as we are, I would not willingly contribute to make the rent worse. Those who wish to pursue the subject calmly, might be amply satisfied by the very clear and full statement in the valuable work of Bp. Bethell<sup>1</sup>; for myself, I had rather continue to be termed "heretic" by those who know me not, than give occasion to any to become a "schismatic." It was the fault of the Church, in the last century, or rather of those who had the mastery over the Church, that her Ministers, by preaching her doctrines negatively or coldly, gave occasion to many whose spirit God had stirred, to seek instruction rather in the writings of those not of her Communion—the old Non-Conformists—than within herself. They were reproached in their day, as their successors now in turn reproach those who would build up the ancient doctrine. Their forefathers' was the happier lot. As however it has been sown, so must we reap; the true leaven will, we hope, in time

<sup>1</sup> General View of the Doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, c. 6. ed. 2.

leaven the whole lump, not by expelling any particles of it, but by converting them into itself; Moses' rod will swallow up the rest; meanwhile, while it is our duty to teach our own people that sound doctrine, one would rather endeavour to gain access in some other way to those whom we are not obliged to instruct, and not, upon a topic on which they are least inclined to be patient, urge upon them the words of a mother, whom they reverence not enough to obey against their own views, and whom possibly they might forsake. Others may do it, who could do it with less invidiousness. Not as if I entertained any doubt, my Lord, that we speak with our Church in this point, and that every syllable of her teaching in her services for Baptism, Confirmation, and the Catechism goes the same way; and that her Articles imply the same; (many who held otherwise, have seen this, when they came to study their Church's services dispassionately;) but that it seems useless and ungracious for us to press upon them, that their Church holds the doctrine, until their prejudices against it shall first be, as those of many are being, somewhat softened. And then the teaching of their Church will be plain to them. We would wish to gain, not to exasperate them. And in turn we might perhaps claim so much courtesy that the name of "heretic" or "heresy" should not be so freely used of doctrines, which, themselves confess, certain expressions<sup>1</sup> in the services of the Church

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 112. "This one ordinance, Baptism, is made with many the point on which every thing turns. This probably

seem at first sight to favour. It seems hard measure to bestow on us the title "heretic" for taking literally those words of our Church, which they defend by supposing them to be spoken "in the judgment of charity," thereby allowing that our's is the plain and grammatical meaning, only that on other grounds it is to be taken with some allowance. And this courtesy we would claim rather for their own sakes than for our's.

And to this reconciliation it may perhaps the rather tend, if I add that we do not wish to enforce any technical view of Baptismal regeneration: for myself, I should be fully content with any view, which acknowledged in its simple sense the words which our Church teaches every child to say of itself, "wherein  
 "I was made a child of God, a member of Christ, and  
 "an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven;" (meaning of course, really what is there said, a real child of God, and a real member of CHRIST, not *simply* an  
 "outward member of an outward body of people  
 "called Christians.") The same truth may be variously viewed; contemplated on different sides; nay, it must be, according to our moral character, differently appreciated; and so it may be that persons holding different language may in fact be expressing different parts of the same truth, and speaking of it in different relations, but still hold it. The Western arises from a feeling that their main strength lies in this direction. We admit that the Church is more open to misconstruction on this point than on most others."—Fraser, p. 16.

Church after St. Augustine, *chiefly* spoke of the blessings of Baptism as the remission of sins ; the Eastern as the introduction of a new principle of life ; but both as flowing from our engrafting into CHRIST. To us, engrafting into, or being made a member of CHRIST, appears the fullest, as it is the most exalted expression of that doctrine, and yet in harmony also with what we see of the corruption of the actual Christian world, in that, though all have been made branches of the true Vine once, they only, which bear fruit, abide in CHRIST; the rest are “ cast forth as a branch and withered.” Yet though we would be thankful to be made the instruments of raising men’s sense of the privileges of their Baptism, and cannot but see that, when it was held in its fulness, it cast a reality over other doctrine, and was a high spring to Christian action, we wish not to restrain the liberty of others. There is unquestionably in Christian Antiquity a tone about this and other connected truths, with which our present language and feelings and habits stand in melancholy contrast ; but the whole must rise together ; a higher doctrine of the Sacraments will increase men’s sense of their Christian responsibilities ; and more elevated Christian action (and by God’s mercy Christian action is rising, we trust, towards a higher standard amongst us), will fit men to receive higher notions of the Sacraments, and enable them to hold them safely. But to this there are many approximations ; and those, who are sensible of their own infirmities, will hail every approximation with joy, not measur-



ing rigidly how far it seems from their ideal, but rejoicing that, with themselves, it is approaching to it.

As tending to this end of peace, which your Lordship would so gladly promote, I may be permitted to adduce a statement by another hand, in which the writer assigns the bounds, within which Baptismal regeneration has been held by the chief Divines of our later Church, and separates off other questions in themselves important, yet still not essentially affecting the main question. In these detached questions many will find that their difficulties lie; and although a man's views of Baptismal regeneration will be affected by the way in which he settles these questions, yet are different views on them consistent with holding the main doctrine, and some may perhaps thereby be enabled to employ the Liturgy of their Church more literally than they at present do. It will happen also not unseldom on these points also, that people using nearly the same language, employ it in a lower or higher sense; as, one by admission into the Christian covenant will understand only an outward, another a mystical, though undefined, change of condition.

The writer then thus explains wherein he conceives the great body of our Divines to be agreed as to this doctrine, and what may be termed open questions among them.

“By<sup>1</sup> this doctrine is meant, first, that the Sa-

<sup>1</sup> Preface to *Catena Patrum*, No. 2, (*Tracts*, No. 76). “Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration.”

“ crament of Baptism is not a mere *sign* or *promise*,  
 “ but actually a *means* of grace, an *instrument*, by  
 “ which, when rightly received, the soul is admitted  
 “ to the benefits of CHRIST’s atonement, such as the  
 “ forgiveness of sin, original and actual, reconcilia-  
 “ tion to God, a new nature, adoption, citizenship in  
 “ Christ’s kingdom, and the inheritance of heaven,—  
 “ in a word, Regeneration. And next, Baptism is  
 “ considered to be rightly received, when there is no  
 “ positive obstacle or hindrance to the reception in  
 “ the recipient, such as impenitence or unbelief  
 “ would be in the case of an adult; so that infants  
 “ are necessarily right recipients of it, as not being  
 “ yet capable of actual sin <sup>1</sup>.

“ There is a variety of questions connected with  
 “ the subject beyond the two positions above set  
 “ down, on which the writers under review differ  
 “ more or less from each other, but not so as in the  
 “ slightest degree to interfere with their clear and  
 “ deliberate maintenance of these. Such, for in-  
 “ stance, as the following:—Whether grace be given  
 “ in and through the water, or only contempora-  
 “ neously with it. Again, whether Baptism, strictly  
 “ speaking, *conveys* the blessings annexed to it, or  
 “ simply *admits* into a state gifted with those bless-  
 “ ings, as being the initiatory rite of the covenant of  
 “ mercy. Or, again, whether or not Baptism, be-  
 “ sides washing away past sin, admits into a state in  
 “ which, for sins henceforth committed, Repentance  
 “ stands in place of a Sacrament, so as to ensure

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 112, 113.

“ forgiveness without specific ordinance ; or whether  
 “ the Holy Eucharist is that ordinance ; or whether  
 “ the full and explicit absolution of sin after Baptism  
 “ is altogether put off till the day of judgment. Or,  
 “ again, there may be difference of opinion as to  
 “ the state of infants dying unbaptized. Or, again,  
 “ whether Regeneration is an instantaneous work  
 “ completed in Baptism, or admits of degrees and  
 “ growth. Or, again, whether or not the Holy Spirit  
 “ can utterly desert a soul once inhabited by Him,  
 “ except to quit it for ever. Or, whether the change  
 “ in the soul made by Baptism is indelible, for good  
 “ or for evil ; or may be undone, as if it had never  
 “ been. Or, how far the enjoyment of the grace  
 “ attached to it is suspended on the condition of our  
 “ doing our part in the Covenant. All these are  
 “ questions, far from unimportant, but which do not  
 “ at present come into consideration ; the one point,  
 “ maintained in the following extracts, being, that  
 “ infants are by and at Baptism unconditionally  
 “ translated from a state of wrath into a state of  
 “ grace and acceptance for Christ’s sake.”

#### Art. XXVIII. *Of the Lord’s Supper.*

On the other great Sacrament, the distinction between the doctrine of our Church, and that of Rome on the one hand, and Ultra-Protestantism on the other, is in reality so broad and distinct, that there is the less difficulty. Nor is it, like Baptismal rege-

neration, the point of divergence of two systems ; and so it may be considered with less view to its consequences as to other portions of truth. And one result of this has been, that many who, from being entangled in a modern system, have parted more or less from our Church's teaching upon Baptism, hold much higher and truer views of this Sacrament. Then also, as recurring in their actual Christian life, they could the less look upon it in an abstract way, or as a theory ; their devotion and love for their Redeemer has sustained their doctrinal views ; and the teaching of their Church has found a more ready entrance, when received apart from controversy, amid the most solemn part of the devotions of the Christian man. This teaching, which we receive in its plain sense, contains, we are persuaded, the full Catholic truth ; we wish neither to add to it, nor to take from it. I would state it in connection with, or in the words of our Formularies. It is, that the " Body and Blood of Christ are *verily* and indeed " taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's " Supper<sup>1</sup> ;" that they are conveyed by means of the elements, in that the article<sup>2</sup> says that " the Body of " Christ is *given*, taken, and eaten in the Supper, " only after an heavenly and spiritual manner ;" for the word " given," as opposed to " taken and received," implies, as has been remarked<sup>3</sup>, that It accompa-

<sup>1</sup> Church Catechism.

<sup>2</sup> Art. XXVIII.

<sup>3</sup> Knox on the use and import of the Eucharistic Symbols. Remains, t. i. p. 170.



nies in some mysterious way, the distribution of the elements, in that It is "given" by the Priest, and "taken and received" by the Communicants; and another article<sup>1</sup> says that the Sacraments "are *effectual* " signs of grace *by* the which He doth work invisibly " in us." Further, we really, though "spiritually eat " the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood<sup>2</sup>;" and, as the fruit of this, "we dwell in Christ and Christ in " us; we are one with Christ and Christ with us;" and of this real indwelling the further fruit, as the Homily<sup>3</sup> said, is our justification and sanctification, "that our sinful<sup>4</sup> bodies are made clean by His Body, " and our Souls washed through His most precious " Blood;" and a continued fitness for Him to dwell therein, "that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us:" further, we do not simply "feed on," as if it were an act of *our* faith *only*, but we are by God *fed* "with<sup>5</sup> the Spiritual food of the most precious

<sup>1</sup> Only one out of *nine* "Reformed" Confessions, *i. e.* such as express the Zuingli-Calvinist doctrines as to the Sacraments, has the word "efficacia," *effectual*, and that one in a different sense; and *two* only use the word "through," or "by," and they explain it away. See Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, Note L, p. 238. ed. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Exhortation at the Communion.

<sup>3</sup> The homily defined this to be the characteristic of the true Sacraments. See above, p. 98. sqq.

<sup>4</sup> Prayer just before the Consecration.

<sup>5</sup> "We most heartily thank Thee, for that *Thou* dost vouchsafe to *feed* us, who have duly received these holy Mysteries, with," &c. —Thanksgiving after the Communion.

“ Body and Blood of His dear Son,” yea “ He<sup>1</sup> hath  
 “ given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ to be our  
 “ Spiritual food and sustenance *in* that holy Sacra-  
 “ ment;” and if we join hereto the lesson which one  
 of the writers of the homilies, bids us “ take<sup>2</sup> of Emis-  
 “ senus a godly father, when we go up to the reve-  
 “ rend communion, to be satisfied with Spiritual  
 “ meats, we look up with faith upon the holy Body and  
 “ Blood of our God; we marvel with reverence; *we*  
 “ *touch it with our mind*; we receive it with the hand  
 “ of our heart; we take it fully with our inward man.”

On this combined teaching of our Articles, Catechism and Liturgy, we believe the doctrine of our Church to be, that in the Communion, there is a true, real<sup>3</sup>, actual, though Spiritual, (or rather the more real, because Spiritual) Communication of the Body and Blood of Christ to the believer through the Holy Elements; that there is a true, real, spiritual, Presence of Christ at the Holy Supper; more real than if we could, with Thomas, feel him with our hands, or thrust our hands into His side; that this is bestowed upon faith, and received by faith, as is every other Spiritual gift, but that our faith is but a receiver of God's real, mysterious, precious, Gift; that faith opens our eyes to see what is really there, and our hearts to receive it; but that It is there independently of our faith.

<sup>1</sup> Exhortation.

<sup>2</sup> First part of homily of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, end.

<sup>3</sup> “ Verily and indeed.”—Church Catechism.

And this real, spiritual Presence it is, which makes it so awful a thing to approach unworthily. It is the Presence of the Holy Ghost within us, imparted by Baptism, and hallowing our bodies as His temple, which makes the profanation of the bodies of the baptized so terrible a sin; it is “the dignity of that holy *Mystery*” which causes “the great peril of the unworthy receiving thereof;” its being “a Divine thing to those who receive It worthily,” which makes It “so dangerous to them that will presume to receive It unworthily.” On no theory, whereby the sacred elements should be *mere* representations, or signs, or pledges, or tokens, of an absent thing, or means to kindle our faith, would the unworthy reception of the Holy Eucharist be so much more dreadful, than profane conduct in Church, where also CHRIST is “in the midst of” us. All which Scripture says of this case, “not discerning the Lord’s Body,” “guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord,” implies an immediate, unseen, Presence of that Body, which the wicked discern not, cannot partake of, but offend against, and so, “eat and drink judgment to themselves” in “that they eat and drink the Sacrament of so great a thing.”

We do not then yield to the Romanists, as to the greatness of our privileges; we do not think that our LORD is less really and spiritually present than they; that He communicates Himself less by His Sacraments than they; that we less receive His Body and Blood, that our sinful bodies are less cleansed by His

glorious Body : that it is less “ the <sup>1</sup> salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death ; a “ deifical communion ; the sweet dainties of our Saviour ; the pledge of eternal health ; the defence “ of faith ; the hope of the Resurrection ; the food of “ immortality ; the healthful grace ; the conservatory “ to everlasting life ; ” we do not believe “ This is My Body ” less than they ; we blame them, not as exceeding as to the greatness of the spiritual gift contained in that Sacrament (all human language and thoughts must fall short), but for their carnal conceptions of it ; for attempting to explain to man’s senses the *mode* of his SAVIOUR’S Presence ; for trying to solve the apparent contradiction that the elements are still what they were, but are, over and above, *to us* the Body and Blood of our LORD ; for longing, with the weak faith of Nicodemus, to know the *how* of things Divine and Spiritual, and so for debasing them, and by their explanations leading, at least their Priesthood, to pride, and then to unbelief.

We would not then, my Lord, insist upon words,

<sup>1</sup> Sayings of the Fathers, quoted in the 1st part of the “ homily of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the “ Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ,” as “ sayings of “ godly men,” “ the ancient Catholic Fathers,” “ truly attributed “ to this celestial banquet and feast,” of which it says, together with some of Holy Scripture, “ if we would often call to mind, “ O how would they influence our hearts to desire the participation of these mysteries, and oftentimes to covet after this “ bread, continually to thirst for this food.”



if others will acknowledge the realities; we are content ourselves to receive the words "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee," &c. as they were used in the ancient Church from which our own preserved and restored them, not as denoting something absent, but as implying the spiritual unseen Presence of that Blessed Body and Blood, conveyed to us through the unchanged though consecrated elements, unchanged in material substance, changed in their use, their efficacy, their dignity, mystically and spiritually. We see not why we need avoid language used by the Fathers, as well as by the ancient Liturgies, and quoted with approbation by great Divines of our Church, that "the bread and wine is made the Body and Blood of Christ <sup>1</sup>," seeing that its being spiritually the Body and Blood of CHRIST, interferes not with its being still corporeally what the Apostle calls it, "the bread and wine," nor with the nature of a Sacrament, but rather the better

<sup>1</sup> "To whom Christ hath imparted power both over that mystical body which is the society of souls, and over that natural which is Himself, for the knitting of both in one; a work, which Antiquity doth call the making of Christ's Body."—Hooker, E. P. V. lxxvii. 2. ed. Keble. "We are not ignorant that the ancient Fathers generally teach, that the bread and wine in the Eucharist by and upon the consecration of them do become, and *are made the Body* and Blood of Christ. But we know also, that though they do not all explain themselves the same way, yet they do all declare their sense to be very dissonant from the doctrine of transubstantiation." Bp. Bull, Corruptions of the Church of Rome, iii. 2. Works, t. ii. p. 255. ed. Burton.

agrees thereto. We would not insist on these words ; only we fear that when men object to them they object not to the words but to the realities, not to the terms, but to the truth they convey.

For deeply as Rome has erred, and much error as she has thereby given occasion to in others, we fear that others have erred still more deeply. Not Zuingli alone, but Calvin, have, in their way, so explained the mode of Christ's presence, as virtually to explain it away. With the fear of a weak faith, that would fain guard in a way of their own against man's giving God's glory to the outward elements, they transferred the presence of Christ *simply* to the believer's soul, and thus, on their side, destroyed "the nature of a Sacrament," depriving it of its inward fulness, as the Romanists, by the doctrine of Transubstantiation, had removed the outward sign. Their theory can hardly be better characterized than by words used by one of a very different school from ourselves, that "the faith of the believer" is not only (which all acknowledge, and as our Article states,) "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is "received and eaten in the Supper," but, is "the true "consecrating principle — that which brings down "Christ to the heart of each individual." The Zuingli-Calvinist theory, however it might disguise itself, (often from itself) in words, came to this ; that the outward elements were not channels or instruments of grace, but that their only office was to kindle the faith of the individual, to set Christ

before his eyes, that so he might in mind ascend into heaven, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God, feed on Him there by faith, appropriate His merits, and thereby become united with Him. And these things they often speak of eloquently, but the Sacraments themselves had no more share in even this elevation of the Christian's soul, than the hearing of God's word, upon which, according to them, their efficacy depended.

We would maintain then, my Lord, that here also our Church holds the Catholic truth distinct from the modern novelties, whether of Rome, or Zurich, or Geneva; that she holds a real, spiritual, presence of our LORD in the Holy Eucharist, that He really and truly therein and thereby imparts Himself, His Body, and His Blood, to the believer; and that through this gift bestowed by Him, and received through faith, Christ dwelleth in us and we in Him: we maintain, on the other side, that Rome has grievously erred by explaining in a carnal way the mode of this Presence, and requiring this her carnal exposition to be received as an article of Faith. She anathematizes<sup>1</sup> us, in our Church, for holding that "in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine," and "denying that wonderful and remarkable conversion of the whole substance of bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of wine into the Blood, so that there re-

<sup>1</sup> Sess. 12, can. 2.

“main only the appearances of bread and wine,” “which,” it proceeds, “the [Roman] Catholic Church “most aptly terms Transubstantiation.” We suppose, also, that they meant it in a carnal and erroneous sense, that they say, “that the Body and Blood of “Christ is” not only “really,” but “*substantially* pre-  
“sent in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist;” for “substantially” they explain to be not simply equivalent to “really,” but “corporeally<sup>1</sup>,” that “the “Body of the LORD is *sensibly*<sup>2</sup> touched by the hands, “broken and bruised by the teeth.” Further, we think it presumptuous to define, as they do<sup>3</sup>, that “Christ is wholly contained under each species,” whereby they would excuse their modern innovation of denying the cup to the laity, and would persuade them by a self-invented and unauthorized theory of modern days, that they receive no detriment thereby. Again, we hold it rash to define peremptorily, “that<sup>4</sup> “the Body and Blood of Christ remain in the consecrated elements, which are not consumed, or are “reserved after the Communion,” (meaning thereby that they so remain, independently of any subsequent participation, as of the sick, or by the communicants) although doubtless they are not common bread and wine, but hallowed. Then, also, we reject what Rome maintains under an anathema, “that<sup>5</sup> “in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ

<sup>1</sup> E. g. Bellarm. Controv. de Sac. Euch. L. 1. c. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Id. lb. L. 3. c. 24.

<sup>3</sup> L. c. cap. 3, and Can. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Can. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Can. 6.



“the Only-begotten Son of God, is to be adored  
 “with the outward adoration of Divine worship, and  
 “to be set forth publicly to the people, in order to  
 “be adored,” nay, “that this most holy Sacrament  
 “rightly received the same Divine worship as is due  
 “to the true God; and that it was not therefore the  
 “less to be adored, because instituted by Christ the  
 “Lord, to be received. For that the same Eternal  
 “God was present in it, Whom, when the Eternal  
 “Father brought into the world, He said, And let  
 “all the angels of God worship Him.” Lastly, as  
 connected with and dependent upon Transubstantiation, we cannot but hold that the “Sacrifice of  
 “masses, in the which it was commonly said that the  
 “Priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to  
 “have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphem-  
 “ous fables and dangerous deceits,” and interfere  
 “with the offering of Christ once made” upon the  
 Cross.

These are the modern corruptions of Rome, which our Church, in her Articles, condemns; and against these, which all spring from the one invention of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, we have repeatedly and often strongly spoken<sup>1</sup>. We have specified the refusal of the cup to the laity, as *one* of the practical grievances of the Church of Rome, which should alone, without further disputing, restrain any from joining himself

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix, Nos. 14. 25. 31, 32, 33. 35. 49. 78. and reprint of Bp. Cosin, ib. Nos. 10, 11.

to her Communion <sup>1</sup>. How it may be with those, who have access to no other, we have no right to determine, though one cannot doubt but that they sustain herein a grievous loss; and the miserable state of Roman Catholic countries in general, may be, in part, owing to this loss: but, for any voluntarily to cast himself out of a Communion, as our own, in the which he may receive it, and to join himself to that in which it is denied him, is such a wanton trifling with privileges, and casting away of God's gifts, and tempting of Him, that I should think this ground alone (which any plain man can understand) reason enough why no member of our Church should join her. It was felt, at the time of the Reformation, to be a very great practical cruelty; so much so, that observers of no mean note have not doubted, that it was the chief ground why the religious so earnestly sought for a Reformation, and that, had Rome conceded this point, the Reformation would never have taken place in the way in which it did. Rome admitted that her modern practice was contrary to the institution of our LORD, and contrary also to the mode in which the Church Universal, for nearly thirteen centuries of her existence, had interpreted that Institution<sup>2</sup>; but in that wantonness of authority,

<sup>1</sup> Ib. Nos. 14. 22.

<sup>2</sup> “ This present holy general Council determines—that although Christ instituted the venerable Sacrament after supper, “ and administered it to His disciples under both kinds of bread “ and wine, yet, notwithstanding, the laudable authority of the

into which her assumed infallibility betrayed her, she preferred contravening Antiquity, and risking division, rather than abandon any practice which she had established, even though not, as she professes,

“ sacred Canons and the approved custom of the Church has and does observe, that this Sacrament ought not to be consecrated after supper, nor received by the faithful except fasting, except in case of sickness, &c. and in like way, that although this Sacrament was in the primitive Church received by the faithful under both kinds, yet to avoid any perils and scandals, the custom has with reason been introduced, that it be received by the officiating priests in both kinds, and by lay people, under the kind of bread only.” Council of Constance, sess. 13. Vasquez (quoted by Bp. Hall, ‘The Old Religion,’ c. 8.) says, “ We cannot deny that in the Latin Church there was the use of both kinds, and that it so continued until the days of St. Thomas, which was about the year of God, 1260.” “ Thus it was,” adds Bp. Hall, “ in the Roman Church ; but as for the Greek, the world knows it never did communicate but under both kinds. These open confessions spare us the labour of quoting the several testimonies of later ages.”

This instance illustrates the difference between the mode in which Anglo and Roman-Catholics view the relation of the Church to Holy Scripture ; Anglo-Catholics take the two facts, that the Church never did consecrate after supper, but always did administer in two kinds, as an authoritative interpretation of our Lord’s will, and supposes that He willed what He did to be followed in the one case, not in the other : the Romish Church regards the former only as a proof of the dispensing power of the Church, and so proceeds to dispense in the other, *contrary* to primitive practice. Thus, Anglo-Catholics take the Primitive Church in both cases as a witness ; Romanists make her a judge, and as establishing a precedent only, which the existing Church may follow out at her own discretion.

matter of faith. Yet she would not depart from her existing customs, or the tradition of two centuries; and so being unable to justify herself on Scripture, as explained by Antiquity, she had recourse to *à priori* grounds, “that <sup>1</sup> it is most firmly “to be believed, and no wise to be doubted, that the “whole Body and Blood of Christ is truly contained “as well under the form of bread as under the form “of wine.” Miserable and rationalistic arguments in Divine Mysteries! as if, where all is subject of Faith, there were any safe rule but to adhere as closely as possible to what seems to be the Divine Ordinance. It seems strange that that misguided Church should not have felt the risk of declaring what the Church Universal had of old esteemed part of the Divine Institution, to be superfluous, and did not dread thus tempting God to withdraw His grace altogether, which they thus presumptuously argued about. This rationalistic argument was met in its own way, that if additional grace were not bestowed through the communion of the Cup, then “the <sup>2</sup> administering Priest received no benefit from it, and (painful as it is to state it) it was “wholly useless and indifferent.” Thus a feigned reverence, (lest haply some accident should befall the consecrated element,) covered a real irreverence;

<sup>1</sup> Council of Constance, l. c.

<sup>2</sup> By many Theologians even of the Council of Trent. Sarpi, L. 6. c. 30. where several other arguments are given.



and real unbelief as to the Virtue of the Sacramental Blood was veiled by a scrupulous care for Its protection. So it ever is, when men forget that "to obey is better than Sacrifice," and would be more jealous for the honour of holy things, than GOD who gave them. The honour of the Eucharist was alleged; the honour of man was the secret motive, lest by concession of the Cup to the laity, the dignity of the Priesthood should be levelled<sup>1</sup>. But thus Rome, rashly binding itself to the hasty and presumptuous decision of the Council of Constance, has inflicted a grievous privation upon her own members, and placed a mark upon herself, which must ever be a hindrance to her own power, and prevent her recovering her undue sway over our Church. An instinctive devotion will guide and protect the religious members of our Church, who might otherwise have been just the most alive to the splendour of many of her pretensions. They might not be able to disentangle their way amid abstract arguments; but they will feel that it would be a loss to be deprived of their SAVIOUR's Blood. Those who engage unprepared in abstract controversies may relapse; the devout Communicant will be safe, who argues not, but obeys. All which Rome could give them, they have already in the Church wherein they were baptized; and they have more. Not here to mention the risk of forfeiture which might be in-

<sup>1</sup> Tridentine Theologians, ap. Sarpi, l. c. especially the Spanish, ib. c. 31.

volved in joining what is here a Schismatic Communion, our Church, though she rightly reject the Sacrifice of Masses, has ever been acknowledged to have that whereof it is the corruption, the true commemorative Sacrifice, representing to God the Death and Passion of His Son, and so acceptable to Him, such as the Church Catholic ever held it<sup>1</sup>; she has the true Communion of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, administered by those ordained by the successors of the Apostles, and that, unimpaired by any "will-worship or voluntary humility," which pretending a self-invented respect, would deprive the laity of a portion of their inheritance and of GOD's gift. We need not now put ourselves in the position that Rome would concede this, and retain her other corruptions<sup>2</sup>; to concede it, Rome must be other than she now is; a strong ground for refusing it was, lest other demands should be made of her<sup>3</sup>. Why then distract ourselves with such gratuitous hypotheses that Rome would concede, what

<sup>1</sup> See Catena, No. 4. Tracts, No. 81, "Testimony of writers of the later English Church to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, with an historical account of the changes made in the Liturgy as to the expression of that doctrine." Courayer, *Défense de la Dissert. sur la Validité des Ordinations Anglaises*, l. 4. c. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Essays on the Church, p. 292.

<sup>3</sup> This was urged by the Spanish Bishops, and those dependant upon Spain, who were the chief opposers of the concession of the Cup at the Council of Trent, Sarpi, l. 6. c. 31. and influenced the legates to resist the united applications of the Imperial and French Ambassadors, ib. c. 35.

for above four centuries she has not conceded? Why suppose that what she refused, when pressed by people and emperors<sup>1</sup>, when she might thereby have retained whole Churches in her Communion, she would now grant in the hope of recovering a few individuals, and thereby own herself doubly in error? Why embarrass ourselves with imagining that what she refused at Trent because she had refused it at Constance, she should now concede, although she has sanctioned by an anathema<sup>2</sup> the *à priori* ground upon which she refused it? She can concede it only on the supposition that the urgent

<sup>1</sup> The Ambassadors of the Emperor and of Bavaria were especially urgent at the Council of Trent, for the restoration of the Cup; they were joined by those of France, Sarpi, l. vi. c. 35. The Imperial Embassadors urged that there "were Catholics in Hungary, Austria, Moravia, Silesia, Carinthia, Carniola, Styria, Bavaria, Suabia, and other parts of Germany, who ardently desired the cup;" in Hungary they went so far, as to "oblige the Priests, by depriving them of their goods, and threatening of their life, to administer the Cup to them." The Imperial and Bavarian ambassadors continued to urge the Council and the Pope, both during its Session and after its close. Sarpi, ib. c. 53; vii. 47; viii. 88. Cassander (ap. Bp. Hall, l. c.) says, "Wherefore not without cause are most of the best Catholics, and most conversant in the reading of Ecclesiastical writers, inflamed with an earnest desire of obtaining the cup of the Lord; that the Sacrament may be brought back to that ancient custom and use, which hath been for many ages perpetuated in the Universal Church." "We need," adds Bp. Hall, "no other advocate."

<sup>2</sup> Sess. 21. can. 3.

demand of it is reasonable; but she has anathematized those “who deny that Jesus Christ, the “Author and Source of all grace, is received “wholly and entirely under one species,” and so has cut herself off from thinking the demand reasonable; and yet, by the strange destiny annexed to these presumptuous reasonings, she has elsewhere awakened the suspicion of loss attached to the denial of the Cup, which she would here allay. For since many members of the Synod of Trent did think it a loss<sup>1</sup>, she was constrained elsewhere simply to state, “that<sup>2</sup> the faithful who receive under the “one species of bread, are not deprived of any grace “*necessary to salvation*,” and so, as was at the time remarked<sup>3</sup>, she “in a manner avowed that they are “deprived of some grace, though not absolutely “necessary. Whereupon they asked, has any human “authority the power to hinder the super-abundant “and non-necessary grace of God? and if so, does “charity admit of thus placing hindrances in the way “of good?” Thus she has placed herself in the position of making unauthorized distinctions as to the grace necessary for us in working out our salvation, and exhibits herself as an unnatural mother, who half-recognises that what she withholds is a blessing, and yet refuses it.

But, so closely do faithful adherence to Apostolic

<sup>1</sup> Visconti ap. Courayer, notes to Sarpi, l. 6. c. 39.

<sup>2</sup> Sess. 21. cap. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Remarks on the Decree recorded by Sarpi, l. c.



doctrine and to Apostolic practice accompany each other, it is plain, my Lord, that it is only upon the high Catholic doctrine of the Holy Communion, that the denial of the Cup is a privation. They who receive the holy elements faithfully, acknowledge, as they receive each consecrated element, that they are receiving respectively, "the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for" them, and His Blood which was for them shed. They reason not, how His Body is separate from His Blood, or what additional blessing the Communion of His Blood bestows upon them. Instinctive reverence, the fruit of reverent Communion, forbids them to enquire or to risk a forfeiture. They pray, "that their sinful bodies may "be made clean by His Body, and their souls washed "by His most precious Blood ;" they hear, severally, the ancient and hallowed words of the Universal Church, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ,"... "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ;" and with an unreasoning piety, which has a mightier hold than any subtilty of Romanist distinction, they would dread to forfeit either portion of the Gift bestowed upon them. But upon any Ultra-Protestant theory, which regards the consecrated elements as "visible symbols of His *absent* Body and Blood," as representations, means of kindling our faith, and the like, the privation of the Cup were no loss. Whosoever having embraced this theory, should continue to regard it as such, must do so by virtue of a piety which his theory had not mastered. It is the *reality* of the Communication of

His Blood by *means* of those forms which He has instituted to convey It, which makes "the Cup which we bless" a blessing, its loss a privation. They who think of the Holy Symbols, as outward only, may retain them as an act of obedience, (and so far is well,) but cannot feel it an essential Blessing. And thus, my Lord, it again appears how a jealous adherence to the high Catholic Doctrines of Antiquity is at the same time a safeguard to retain the affections of our people. Such is not our *end*; but it is a *reward* annexed to faithfulness. Whether those who blame us for insisting so much upon this practical cruelty of the Church of Rome, would themselves feel it as a cruelty, or adequately appreciate the blessings which they enjoy through the restoration of Primitive practice in our Church, is for them to determine.

On the other hand, our Church, as holding the original Catholic truth, of which the corruptions of Rome are the debasement, appears to me yet further removed from those modern traditions, the inventions of men who deny that truth. Rome, in this respect, has the truth, though mingled with error, and clouded and injured by it; the Zuingli-Calvinist School have forfeited it. In a word, our Church holds with Rome the *reality* of the Communication of the Body and Blood of CHRIST through the Holy Eucharist, but denies her carnal way of explaining it, and protests against the corruptions thereby entailed; but in what Rome retains in truth,

she must needs hold with her against those who, explaining to human reason Divine mysteries, cannot but explain away what is mysterious, and resolve the hidden gifts of the Sacrament into aids of contemplation, outward attestations of God's gifts, exhibitions to our outward senses, mere remembrancers of His Death.

I would only observe, in conclusion of this topic, that I wish not to ascribe to our accusers the whole extent of Zuinglian doctrine, however I must think that they fall short of the doctrines of our Church. Happily, the faith of individuals is so sustained by the Liturgy of our Church, that few carry out the erroneous notions of a foreign school, even while they form their minds in it, or embrace detached views out of it. I wish not to speak of individuals, but of systems; individuals, I doubt not, are better than their systems, and far other than their system would be, if developed without restraint; the devotions of our Church have influenced such of her members far more than they are probably themselves aware, and have conveyed to them truth, which they are afraid to express in words, lest it should tend to the exaltation of what seems to them outward; we would not blame *them*; we would only wish to exhibit to them the system which they have partially embraced, that they might extricate themselves wholly from it.

Art. XXIII. *Of ministering in the Congregation.*

We have no objection to admit that the Articles of Edward VI., from which our present are, with some modifications, derived, were formed upon a plan of comprehension; it is an historical <sup>1</sup> fact that, although the scheme failed, they were intended as a general basis of union of Protestants in one Episcopal body. Nor does there seem any necessity that a Church, whose ministers are episcopally ordained, should put forth any formal statement that they must of necessity be so. We therefore acquiesce very readily in the indefiniteness of our Article on this head, which states that we ought "to judge those lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men, who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard," without defining who are invested with this authority. For if any one be willing himself to receive Ordination at the hands of a Bishop, surely, my Lord, nothing further is gained by requiring him to confess that this is the only lawful Ordination. But comprehensive Articles are not at the same time exclusive. Our Articles surely are not in such wise a rule of belief, that we are to hold nothing for true which is not contained in them; we are not bound to have no opinion *beside* them, provided we hold

<sup>1</sup> See Authorities, Tract 81. p. 27. *note*.



none *against* them. Yet this is what these charges come to. The compilers of the Articles, intending them for subscription, *required* no more definite opinion upon the subject; therefore, say these, they forbade it. But the Articles are not the only, often not the fullest, statements of the doctrines or tenets of our Church. They are often to be interpreted or to be filled up out of her other documents. Thus as, on the Sacraments, the teaching of the Articles is materially cleared and filled up by the Catechism and the Services, so, on Ordination, a consistent Churchman would naturally have recourse to those services to which in her Articles (Art. XXXVI.) she refers. The Preface then to “the Form and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,” thus speaks :

“It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient Authors, that *from the Apostles’ time*, there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ’s Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.—And therefore to the intent that these Orders may be *continued*, and reverently used and esteemed, in the united Church of England and Ireland, no man shall be accounted and taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the united Church of England and Ireland, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.”

For herself, then, clearly, our Church regards none to be lawfully consecrated or ordained except those who have received Episcopal Consecration or Ordination; and, in her practice, conformably to this rule, she admits a Romish Priest, who relinquishes his errors, to exercise his functions without reordination, but not one who has received Presbyterian Ordination. The principles, however, of this Preface go further; for Episcopacy is stated to be an Apostolic Ordinance, and if Apostolic, then Divine. And this view I need not say has been held by the great stream of our Divines<sup>1</sup>; nor, having an Apostolic Ordinance, have men, until lately, been ashamed to avow it.

It would then be altogether inexplicable how the avowal of what is commonly entitled "Apostolical succession" should have been received with so much tumult, had one not reason to believe, that many of the anonymous writers, who have been for some years raising it, belong to bodies which have forfeited that Ordinance.

Leaving these, however, I might take this occasion to remove some of the misconceptions which have been raised about it. The objection is ordinarily thus couched: "If the Sacraments are necessary to salvation, and can only be administered by one Episcopally ordained, then among Presbyterian bodies, there are no Sacraments, and consequently no sal-

<sup>1</sup> See *Catena Patrum*, No. 1. *Tracts*, No. 74.

“vation, or at least they are left to the uncovenanted  
“mercies of God.”

Yet to make deductions from a doctrine, is not the safest way of understanding it. Men in these days are not apt to infer, that because there is no salvation except through the Name of JESUS CHRIST, therefore all the Heathen must be condemned ; nay, though our Articles say, that they are to be “held accursed  
“that presume to say that every one shall be saved  
“by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he  
“be diligent to frame his life according to that law  
“and the light of nature,” (Art. XVIII.) people are content to stop short, resting in the positive revealed truth, that salvation is through CHRIST alone ; but not enquiring “who then shall be saved?”

And within these same bounds we have confined ourselves. Episcopacy and Presbyterianism (as excluding Episcopacy) cannot be true together, any more than any other two opposites. If Episcopacy be Apostolic and an ordinance of GOD, Presbyterianism is not ; if Presbyterianism is, then Episcopacy is not ; and this was ever so held until these modern days, when men have consented to merge their differences in a common indifference ; and is probably still held by the Dissenters from our Church. For they felt that to justify their schism, it was necessary to show that our Church required things unlawful, and Episcopacy was accordingly counted among the signs that our Church was a portion of Antichrist. Episcopacy was denounced as Antichristian <sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See *e. g.* Archbishop Bramhall quoted below p. 165. Beza

Without imitating their harshness, we, in our turn, would say, since Episcopacy is an Ordinance of God, to abandon it is sin ; the degree of that sin, or its effects, we are not called upon to pronounce on, nor would we. Only, as watchmen, we are bound to warn against this, as against every other sin ; and the more against this, because men are now so careless about it. Even Calvin spoke very differently when he said, “they are worthy of any Anathema, who <sup>1</sup>, when they can have Bishops, have them not.” So neither then would we take upon ourselves to say any thing as to the efficacy of the Sacraments administered by those, whom we cannot hold to have been rightly ordained. We hold only that they have not *duly received the Commission* to administer them. And this will be plain to any Presbyter, if he make the case his own. As Presbyters, we *received no Commission*, either alone, or in conjunction with others, to ordain others to dispense the word of God, and His holy Sacraments; and what we have not received, we cannot give. That word and those Sacraments

divides Episcopacy into Divine, human, and Satanic. Divine according to him, is the ministry generally ; human, is the placing one Presbyter above the rest with limited authority ; Satanic, is where the Episcopacy is entirely separate from the Presbytery, and has exclusive authority. This is repeated by the Puritan writers in their answers of the English Church, *e. g.* Calderwood, Altare Damascenum, c. 4. yet Beza himself said of our Bishops, “ Let her enjoy this singular bounty of God, which “ I wish she may hold for ever.” (Quoted by Bp. Hall, Episcopacy by Divine right, p. 1. c. 4.)

<sup>1</sup> See Bp. Hall, Episcopacy by Divine right, p. i. c. 2.



we do administer, because we have been commissioned so to do; we do not pretend to empower others, because, not being commissioned, we have not been empowered. In like manner, neither Luther nor Wesley, (any more than Calvin, who was himself never ordained,) had any commission, by themselves, or with other Presbyters, to ordain others; and so those ordained by them *have received no commission* to administer the Sacraments. Mere length of time cannot mend the original invalidity. And this original difficulty seems to have been felt alike by Luther and Wesley. It is well known that Wesley reluctantly took the step of ordaining at all; that he meant those whom he ordained, to be subordinate auxiliaries to the ministry; and that, to the last, he refused, in the strongest terms, his consent that those thus ordained should take upon them to administer the Sacraments<sup>1</sup>; he felt that it exceeded his powers, and so inhibited it, however it might diminish the numbers of the society he had framed. In like manner Luther, as has been observed<sup>2</sup>, gave to those ordained by him, new titles; not venturing to attribute

<sup>1</sup> He was consulted how to proceed with a society, who threatened to leave the Connection, unless permitted to have the Sacraments administered by their own preachers. His answer was, "Modern laziness has jumbled together the two distinct offices of preaching and administering the Sacraments. But, be that as it may, I will rather lose twenty societies than separate from the Church." This was only about three years before his death. The letter was first published in the Brit. Mag. vol. vi. p. 297.

<sup>2</sup> Palmer on the Church, part i. c. 12. sect. 4. t. i. p. 387.

to them those belonging to the offices conferred by the regular ordination. But irregular practice is the parent of irregular principles; and the wider deviation incident to that practice begets a new train of principles. Man must justify himself in his own sight; if then he conform not his practice to his principles, his practice will bend his principles. The legality of even Presbyterian Ordination, the theory, that the right of Ordination resides "in the body corporate of the Church"<sup>1</sup> (to be of any use in this argument it must be "in any section of the Church"), these and the like, are so many after thoughts to justify what was done in the first instance on Saul's plea of "necessity;" "I<sup>2</sup> forced myself therefore, and offered a burnt-offering."

But while maintaining that they only are *commissioned* to administer the Sacraments, who have received that commission from those appointed in succession to bestow it, we have never denied that God *may* make His own Sacraments efficacious, even when irregularly administered; we should trust it might be so: some of us are bound up by ties of affection to those very Protestant bodies, which it is supposed we should so harshly and wantonly cut off from the Church of CHRIST. The very same affection for them which would make us long to see them safely restored to the full privileges of the Church, makes us trust that the Father of mercies has not

<sup>1</sup> Episcopacy, Tradition, and the Sacraments, considered in reference to the Oxford Tracts, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Sam. xiii. 12.

“one blessing” only, but has “a blessing for them also, even for them.”

Still every one would apprehend risk in certain cases of irregularity: few, for instance, would think themselves safe in receiving the LORD’s Supper from a layman or from a woman; and the greater the irregularity, and the less excuse for it, the greater would be esteemed the risk. Thus dissenters would obviously run greater risk of having the efficacy of the Sacraments diminished, than the present Presbyterians of Scotland; and these perhaps more than the German bodies, whose forefathers did not wilfully renounce the privilege of Episcopacy, and have not a pure Apostolic Church with which they might unite, nor have had before their eyes the instructive example of her patient and suffering piety. Nor, again, are we called upon to think what mitigating effect inveterate prejudice may have; the present Protestants have been brought into their state not by their own deed, but by the acts of former generations. Their continuance in that state may be an evil and a loss of privileges, entailed upon them by the act of their forefathers, which they have not cut off; but not the same to individuals as if they had been the authors of it. On the other hand, it is for them to consider that they have not the same plea of necessity which their forefathers urged; that they may readily repair the irregularity for the future; that such an act would doubtless be pleasing to GOD, as evincing an anxiety to conform themselves altogether to His will, and so might bring down a blessing on them-

selves, as well as contribute to the ultimate restoration of unity in the whole Church.

But our immediate practical question is at home. And what Churchman would venture to say that none of the dissenters, that no shade of them, run *any* risk? that people were *equally safe* as to the LORD'S Supper, however administered? that if administered by the congregation to each other, that if a family were to administer it among themselves, they would be *quite secure*? And if there is risk in dispensing with a Minister altogether, why should men be quite certain that there is none in dispensing with one Apostolically ordained? why should we think it an unreasonable thing, that risk should be involved in neglecting an Ordinance of God? The Church of old held that the efficacy of the Sacraments, even when administered by ordained but schismatic ministers, was, at the least, suspended, so long as persons remained in Schism. This is the ground which we have taken, not involving ourselves and others needlessly in questions as to GOD'S dealings with others, but providing, as far as in us lay, for the safety of our own people. We have told them, that, at the least, they are safer if they abide in the Church. I might cite to this end, one of the earliest tracts<sup>1</sup> in this

<sup>1</sup> Tract 4. p. 3. The question, "Do you then unchurch all the Presbyterians?" was also there answered, p. 5, and many hard words might have been saved, had persons read what is said in the Tracts, instead of making inferences from them, unread. The kirk of Scotland was also kindly spoken of, in the very poem, so often cited in proof of want of charity towards it; "Samaria."



series, when the Apostolic succession, being so lost out of sight, was more continually put forward than there is, happily, now, any occasion to do. "Jesus Christ's own commission is the best external security I can have, that in receiving this bread and wine, I verily receive His Body and Blood. Either the Bishops have that commission, or there is no such thing in the world. For, at least, Bishops have it with as much evidence as Presbyters without them. In proportion, then, to my Christian anxiety for keeping as near my Saviour as I can, I shall of course be very unwilling to separate myself from Episcopal communion. And in proportion to

There is certainly an analogy between the proceedings of Jeroboam and those of John Knox. The making of the calves, although eminently "*the sin wherewith Jeroboam made Israel to sin,*" was not his only sin : it is added, "he made priests out of all the people, which were not of the sons of Levi," (the Hebrew word means rather, "out of the people indiscriminately," than as in the E. V. "of the lowest of the people,") and these were to offer not to the calves, but "on the high-places," where the true God was worshipped, though not as He had appointed. This sin then was a self-chosen ordination. And this Scotland likewise committed, in rejecting Episcopacy, which she already had in a pure Church. As God, however, left not Samaria without seers, so also has He raised up gifted men for Scotland, and has doubtless among those, who have forsaken the Apostolic Church, His 7000, who have not been involved in any of the further consequences of that first sin. Tract 47 (on the "Visible Church," No. 4), contains a warm statement how the sense of the superior privileges of our Church is compatible with charity, and tends to individual humility.

“ my charitable care for others, will be my industry  
 “ to preserve and extend the like consolation and  
 “ security to them.” And again <sup>1</sup>, “ Why should we  
 “ talk so much of an ‘establishment,’ and so little of  
 “ an ‘Apostolical Succession?’ Why should we not  
 “ seriously endeavour to impress *our people* with this  
 “ plain truth—that by separating themselves from our  
 “ communion, they separate themselves not only from  
 “ a decent, orderly, useful society, but from the only  
 “ Church in this realm which *has a right to be quite*  
 “ *sure* that she has the Lord’s Body to give to the  
 “ people.”

And this language does not at all go beyond the glowing words of Hooker, in vindicating the divine commission which must necessarily belong to “ the ministry in things divine.” And he too, however he might make allowances for cases of apparent necessity (which was the more natural in those times, when the tendency of Ultra-Protestantism had not been developed), held that the Episcopal Ordination was the only authorized transmission of that authority<sup>2</sup>. He says then <sup>3</sup> . . . “ In that they are Christ’s ambassadors and His labourers, who should give them  
 “ their commission, but He Whose most inward  
 “ affairs they manage? Is not God alone the Father

<sup>1</sup> Tract 4. p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> See Mr. Keble’s Preface to Hooker, p. lxx—lxx.

<sup>3</sup> Eccl. Pol. V. lxxvii. 1, 2. 7. ed. Keble, quoted Tracts, No 74. Catena, No. 1. “ Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of the Apostolical succession.”

“ of spirits? Are not souls the purchase of Jesus  
 “ Christ? What angel in heaven could have said  
 “ to man, as our Lord did unto Peter, ‘ Feed My  
 “ sheep,—preach—baptize—do this in remembrance  
 “ of Me. Whose sins ye retain, they are retained;  
 “ and their offences in heaven pardoned, whose  
 “ faults you shall on earth forgive? What think  
 “ we? Are these terrestrial sounds, or else are  
 “ they voices uttered out of the clouds above? The  
 “ power of the ministry of God translateth out of  
 “ darkness into glory; it raiseth man from the  
 “ earth and bringeth God Himself from heaven; *by*  
 “ *blessing visible elements it maketh them invisible*  
 “ *graces*; it giveth daily the Holy Ghost; *it hath to*  
 “ *dispose of that flesh which was given for the life of*  
 “ *the world, and the Blood which was poured out to*  
 “ *redeem souls*; when it poureth malediction upon  
 “ the heads of the wicked, they perish; when it re-  
 “ voketh the same, they revive. O wretched blind-  
 “ ness, if we admire not so great power; more  
 “ wretched if we consider it aright, and notwith-  
 “ standing, imagine that any but God can bestow it?  
 “ To whom Christ hath imparted power, both over  
 “ that mystical body which is the society of souls,  
 “ and over that natural which is Himself, for the  
 “ knitting of both in one (a work which Antiquity  
 “ doth call the making of Christ’s Body,) the same  
 “ power is in such not amiss both termed a kind of  
 “ mark or character, and acknowledged to be inde-  
 “ libile. . . . . ‘ Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins

“ soever ye remit, they are remitted ; whose sins ye  
 “ retain, they are retained.’ Whereas, therefore, the  
 “ other Evangelists had set down, that Christ did, be-  
 “ fore His suffering, promise to give His Apostles the  
 “ keys of the kingdom of heaven, and being risen  
 “ from the dead, promised moreover at that time a  
 “ miraculous power of the Holy Ghost, St. John  
 “ addeth, that He also invested them even then  
 “ with the power of the Holy Ghost for castigation  
 “ and relaxation of sin, wherein was fully accom-  
 “ plished that which the promise of the keys did im-  
 “ port. Seeing therefore, that the same power is  
 “ now given, why should the same form of words  
 “ expressing it be thought foolish ?”

We would speak then, my Lord, as we have  
 spoken, *positively* ; we would point out to those who  
 are of our Communion, this security in remaining in  
 her, to those who, or their forefathers, have deserted  
 her, the superior safety in returning to her. The  
 argument, that they only can lawfully administer in  
 Divine things, who have been called thereto, is so  
 plain, and so impressed upon men’s minds by natural  
 reverence, that such as have had no outward call,  
 have ever rested their claim upon an inward call ;  
 and so acknowledge the principle : but however men  
 have in this way persuaded themselves that they  
 were called to preach the word, no one, I believe,  
 ever yet imagined himself so called to administer  
 the Sacraments. Indeed the general tendency of  
 this class has been to neglect the Sacraments, and



substitute preaching for them, following that to which they conceived themselves called, and magnifying it to the derogation of the Ordinances, to administer which they had no call. The administration of the Sacraments, when it has been ventured upon, has generally been, as in the case of the Wesleyans, a subsequent expedient, to round a system, and make it independent of the Church. We doubt not, then, but that by GOD's blessing, the more courageous avowal of the undoubted privileges of our Apostolic Church would regain many of her lost children to her, and save her from having to deplore the loss of others, would check the growth of schism, and tend to heal her breaches. And the vehemence with which this principle has been attacked by Dissenters, might show men that its importance has been felt by those without also ; they would not trouble themselves about the maintenance of an abstract principle, unless they saw its tendency (which has already to some extent been realized), to strengthen the Church, and to diminish the several secessions from it. To these, our own Church's erring children, is our first duty. Yet may it perhaps not be too much to hope, that the more complete developement of the principles of our Church, may influence also those religious bodies, the foreign Protestants, about which persons profess so much concern. And thus the time may be hastened, when we may be all "one fold under One Shepherd." Certainly, if we have been intrusted with privileges, which other reformed bodies lost, it was not, that they should be "put under a bushel, but on a candle-

“stick, that” our “candle which our God hath lighted for us may give light to all them that are in “the house.” It were ungrateful to ALMIGHTY GOD, Who, amid so many perils, some common to the general “breaking up of the fountains of the great deep” whereby the previous corruptions were cleansed, others peculiar to our own land, still provided that our Ark should be borne safe above the waters; it were real unkindness to other bodies of Christians, to dissemble our privileges, and not rather to glory in them and in Him who gave them, that others may be kindled with a godly zeal, and behold, and partake of them.

Although, however, we have been careful not to go beyond our measure, and have not needlessly spoken of other bodies, yet may it be useful to allude to one remarkable fact bearing on this question. The doctrine of Apostolical succession and that of the Sacraments, viewed in the abstract, would to most, probably, not seem at first sight to be so connected together, that a false view of the one would involve error upon the other; much less, that the denial of the one should entail a fundamental change in the other. Yet so it has been. It seems as though people had been deterred by an instinctive dread from taking *upon themselves* the office of administering the Holy Eucharist, with the full consciousness of its mysteriousness. It is too awful for man to undertake unbidden; he cannot invest *himself* with the belief that in Hooker’s words, “in blessing visible elements” he has the power to “make

them invisible grace," any more than he can give *himself* the commission so to do: man's belief in this awful privilege, so surpassing human thought, must come from above; he can only believe it, when he has solemnly been invested with it. Accordingly, where people have acted without this commission, there they have unconsciously lowered the doctrine. In the thoughts of many Wesleyans, at least, "means of grace" will signify—not the Holy Eucharist, but their own peculiar discipline, their "class meetings" or their "love-feasts." They have often lost even the abstract belief, that the Holy Communion is any way more solemn, or attended with more mysterious blessing. With a ministry "not of the sons of Levi<sup>1</sup>," they have "ordained a feast" also "like unto the feast which is in Judah," and have come to think their own feast, which they had "devised of their own heart," to be as acceptable to GOD, and as rich in blessing to them as that "ordained by Christ Himself." And so likewise as to other bodies; the further any have departed from the doctrine of the Apostolic succession, so much the lower has their doctrine of the Sacraments become; as at the very outset, the system of Luther, (himself a Priest,) though in part erroneous, was higher than that of Calvin and Zuingli, who were laymen. And yet now after the lapse of three centuries, even the peculiar doctrine of Lutheranism is well nigh extinct; those who

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kings xii. 31—33.

maintain it are, in one large country of the reformation, a proscribed sect. Mostly, it has amalgamated itself with the Calvinistic doctrine. Shrinking then from saying any thing as to GOD's dealings with individuals, it would yet seem that, upon their own scheme of doctrine, the Holy Eucharist must be to many bodies, at least, other than it is to us. For what we believe it to be, that they reject. They do not believe that it conveys really, though spiritually, the Body and Blood of CHRIST; painful as it is to say, they repudiate as Popish, the real, invisible, Presence of CHRIST; they resolve into a figure the real actual Indwelling of CHRIST thereby. Since then faith is the means, whereby *we* become partakers of the gifts already stored up for us, what would there be harsh or unkind in thinking that they had not, what they deny themselves to have? especially when our object is to persuade them to return where they may believe and may have it? It is the substance of their own statement, when one says, in a passage<sup>1</sup> singled out for blame, "In the judgment of the Church, the Eucharist administered without Apostolical commission, may to pious minds be a very edifying ceremony, but it is not that blessed thing which our Saviour graciously meant it to be; it is not 'verily and indeed taking and receiving' the Body and Blood of Him, our Incarnate Lord." For they themselves so speak of

<sup>1</sup> Tract 66. p. 7.



it, as an outward means to kindle faith; they place the very essence of Sacraments in their instructiveness<sup>1</sup>; what injury then is done them, if any say that they have not, what they refuse? or why may we not claim to our own Church, what she professes to receive from God's all-gracious hand? What they claim, is not denied them; we trust that the "edifying rite" which they hold the Communion to be, may be, by God's mercy, beneficial to them; why should they grudge us its being to us "that blessed thing which we believe our Saviour graciously meant it to be." If they will not "enter in themselves," why should they "hinder those who are entering?"

This view of the case, whereby we are enabled to maintain uncompromisingly the truth, and yet to entertain kindly and charitable and sympathetic feelings for those who have lost some of the privileges of our Church, is so fully and so tenderly put by the great Bramhall, that I would again extract his words; and our previous selection of them might have shown people our sentiments, would they have read before they blamed.

"But<sup>2</sup> because I esteem them Churches not completely formed, do I, therefore, exclude them from

<sup>1</sup> See Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, p. 122-4. 245. ed. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Vindication of the Church of England, disc. 3. quoted more fully Tracts, No. 74. Catena on the "Apostolical succession," p. 12, 13. It appears from Abp. Bramhall, that the charge of want of charity for maintaining the Apostolical succession was then brought by the Romanists.

“ all hopes of salvation? or esteem them aliens from  
 “ the commonwealth of Israel? or account them  
 “ formal schismatics? No such thing. First, I know  
 “ there are many learned persons among them who  
 “ do passionately affect Episcopacy; some of which  
 “ have acknowledged it to myself, that their Church  
 “ would never be rightly settled, until it was new  
 “ moulded<sup>1</sup>. Baptism is a Sacrament, the door of  
 “ Christianity, a matriculation into the Church of  
 “ Christ: yet the very desire of it in case of necessity,  
 “ is sufficient to excuse from the want of actual Bap-  
 “ tism. And is not the desire of Episcopacy sufficient  
 “ to excuse from the actual want of Episcopacy, in  
 “ like case of necessity? or should I censure these as  
 “ schismatics?

“ Secondly, there are others, who though they do  
 “ not long so much for Episcopacy, yet they approve  
 “ it, and want it only out of invincible necessity.  
 “ In some places the sovereign is of another com-  
 “ munion; the Episcopal chairs are filled with Roman  
 “ Bishops. If they should petition for Bishops of  
 “ their own, it would not be granted. In other  
 “ places the magistrates have taken away Bishops;  
 “ whether out of policy, because they thought that

<sup>1</sup> It were difficult to point out the difference between this ad-  
 mission of the “ Reformed” themselves, and a saying of Mr.  
 Froude’s, selected for censure, as referring to the “ Reformation,  
 “ every where but in England.” (Essays, p. 285.) “ The Reforma-  
 “ tion was a limb badly set—it must be broken again in order to  
 “ be righted.” Remains, vol. i. p. 433.

“ the regiment not so proper for their republics, or  
 “ because they were ashamed to take away the  
 “ revenues, and preserve the order, or out of a blind  
 “ zeal, they have given an account to God: they  
 “ owe none to me. Should I condemn all these as  
 “ schismatics for want of Episcopacy, who want it  
 “ out of invincible necessity?

“ Thirdly, there are others who have neither the  
 “ same desires, nor the same esteem of Episcopacy,  
 “ but condemn it as an Antichristian innovation, and  
 “ a rag of Popery. I conceive this to be most gross  
 “ schism materially. It is ten times more schisma-  
 “ tical to desert, nay, to take away (so much as lies  
 “ in them) the whole order of Bishops, than to sub-  
 “ tract obedience from one lawful Bishop. All that  
 “ can be said to mitigate this fault is, that they do it  
 “ ignorantly, as they have been mistaught and mis-  
 “ informed. And I hope that many of them are free  
 “ from obstinacy, and hold the truth implicitly in the  
 “ preparation of their minds, being ready to receive  
 “ it when God shall reveal it to them. How far this  
 “ may excuse (not the crime but) their persons from  
 “ formal schism, either *à toto* or *à tanto*, I determine  
 “ not, but leave them to stand or fall to their own  
 “ Master.”

And again, in answer to the same charge whereto  
 we are subjected, of having “ a design to bring the  
 “ Pope into England,” in that they “ unchurch either  
 “ all or most of the Protestant Churches, and maintain  
 “ the Roman Church and not their’s to be true :”

“ His<sup>1</sup> assumption is wanting, which should be  
 “ this : but a considerable party of Episcopal divines  
 “ in England do unchurch all or most of the Protes-  
 “ tant Churches, and maintain the Roman Church to  
 “ be a true Church, and these to be no Churches. I  
 “ can assent to neither of his propositions, nor to any  
 “ part of them, as true, *sub modo*, as they are al-  
 “ leged by him.

“ First, I cannot assent to his major proposition,  
 “ that all those who make an ordinary personal  
 “ uninterrupted succession of Pastors, to be of the  
 “ integrity of a true Church, (which is the ground of  
 “ his exception,) have, therefore, an intention, or  
 “ can justly be suspected thereupon to have any  
 “ intention, to introduce the Pope. The Eastern,  
 “ Southern, and Northern Churches are all of them  
 “ for such a personal succession, and yet all of them  
 “ utter enemies to the Pope. Secondly, I cannot  
 “ assent to his minor proposition, that either all or  
 “ any considerable part of the Episcopal divines in  
 “ England, do unchurch either all or most part of the  
 “ Protestant Churches. No man is hurt but by him-  
 “ self. They unchurch none at all, but leave them  
 “ to stand or fall to their own Master. They do not  
 “ unchurch the Swedish, Danish, Bohemian, Churches,  
 “ and many other Churches in Polonia, Hungaria,  
 “ and those parts of the world, who have an ordinary  
 “ uninterrupted succession of Pastors, some by the

<sup>1</sup> Vindication of Grotius, disc. 3. quoted *ib.* p. 14 & 16.



“ name of Bishops, others under the name of Seniors,  
 “ unto this day ; (I meddle not with the Socinians :)  
 “ they unchurch not the Lutheran Churches in Ger-  
 “ many, who both assert Episcopacy in their confes-  
 “ sions, and have actual superintendents in their  
 “ practice, and would have Bishops, name and thing,  
 “ if it were in their power. Let him not mistake  
 “ himself: those Churches which he is so tender of,  
 “ though they be better known to us by reason of  
 “ their vicinity, are so far from being ‘all or most  
 “ part of the Protestant Churches,’ that being all put  
 “ together, they amount not to so great a proportion  
 “ as the Britannick Churches alone. And if one  
 “ excluded out of them all those who want an ordi-  
 “ nary succession without their own faults, out of  
 “ invincible ignorance or necessity, and all those who  
 “ desire to have an ordinary succession either ex-  
 “ plicitly or implicitly, they will be reduced to a  
 “ little flock indeed.

“ But let him set his heart at rest. I will remove  
 “ this scruple out of his mind, that he may sleep  
 “ securely upon both ears. Episcopal divines do not  
 “ deny those Churches to be true Churches, wherein  
 “ salvation may be had. We advise them, as it is  
 “ our duty, to be circumspect for themselves, and  
 “ not to put it to more question, whether they have  
 “ ordination or not, or desert the general practice of  
 “ the universal Church for nothing, when they may  
 “ clear it if they please. Their case is not the same  
 “ with those who labour under invincible necessity.

“ What mine own sense is of it, I have declared  
 “ many ye s since to the world in print ; and in the  
 “ same way received thanks, and a public acknow-  
 “ ledgment of my moderation from a French divine.  
 “ And yet more particularly in my reply to the  
 “ Bishop of Chalcedon, Pres. p. 144. and cap. 1. p.  
 “ 164. Episcopal divines will readily subscribe to  
 “ the determination of the learned Bishop of Win-  
 “ chester, in his answer to the Second Epistle of  
 “ Molineus. ‘ Nevertheless, if our form (of Episco-  
 “ pacy) be of divine right, it doth not follow from  
 “ thence, that there is no salvation without it, or  
 “ that a Church cannot consist without it. He is  
 “ blind who does not see Churches consisting without  
 “ it : he is hard-hearted who denyeth them salvation.  
 “ We are none of those hard-hearted persons, we put  
 “ a great difference between these things. There  
 “ may be something absent in the exterior regiment,  
 “ which is of divine right, and yet salvation to be  
 “ had.’ This mistake proceedeth, from not distin-  
 “ guishing between the true nature and essence of a  
 “ Church, which we do readily grant them, and the  
 “ integrity or perfection of a Church, which we can-  
 “ not grant them, without swerving from the judg-  
 “ ment of the Catholic Church.”

Exactly the same line is taken by the mild and  
 moderate Bishop Hall, as all know, a tender lover of  
 peace, and whose natural prejudices, through his  
 education by a Puritan mother, ran the other way ;  
 yet these were his matured thoughts. It is well also

to hear the solemn feelings with which he commenced his "Episcopacy by Divine Right." "For me, I am "now breathing towards the end of my race, the "goal is already in my eyes—I that am now setting "foot over the threshold of the house of my age, "what aim can I have but the issue of my last "account, whereto I am ready to be summoned "before the Judge of quick and dead? Setting, "therefore, that awful Tribunal, to which we shall "shortly be presented, before our eyes, let us reason "the case with a modest earnestness." This frame of mind of the aged and pious man, who thought the defence of Episcopacy, as a "Divine institution," an acceptable employment of his latter days, when "the time of his departure was at hand," is surely somewhat different from those of the younger men now, who adduce anxiety about the Apostolic succession as a foremost testimony, that we "pay<sup>1</sup> "greater attention to the form and vehicle in which "the divine mercy is conveyed to us, than to the "truth and power of the blessing itself." Bishop Hall then proceeds to distinguish between the case of the Scottish Bishop, with whom he was expostulating for having renounced his Episcopal function, and that of the foreign Protestant bodies; "know<sup>2</sup>, their case "and your's is far enough different; they plead to be "by a kind of necessity cast upon that condition,

<sup>1</sup> Essays on the Church, p. 309, 10.

<sup>2</sup> Episcopacy by Divine Right, p. i. § 2.

“ which you have willingly chosen ; they were not,  
 “ they could not be, what you were, and still might  
 “ have been. Did any of them forsake and ab-  
 “ jure that function of Episcopacy, which he might  
 “ freely have enjoyed with the full liberty of pro-  
 “ fessing the reformed religion ?” It is then on this  
 same plea of *necessity*, that Bishop Hall excused the  
 German reformers ;—because<sup>1</sup> they were willing to  
 “ maintain and establish Episcopal government, de-  
 “ sirous to restore it, troubled that they might not  
 “ continue it : might they have enjoyed the Gospel,  
 “ they would have enjoyed Episcopacy ;” “ all the  
 “ world sees the Apologist professteth for them, [the  
 “ German reformers,] that they greatly desired to  
 “ conserve the government of Bishops, that they were  
 “ altogether unwillingly driven from it ; that it was  
 “ utterly against their heart, that it should have been  
 “ impaired or weakened ; that it was only the per-  
 “ sonal cruelty and violence of their Romish perse-  
 “ cutors which was then excepted against ;” he excuses  
 it, because<sup>2</sup> “ they took up this equality of govern-  
 “ ment only provisionally ;” because “ they meant not  
 “ to traverse the state of the Clergy, or to submit it to  
 “ their orders, whensoever the Clergy or whole state  
 “ of France should happen to admit the Reformation ;”  
 because “ they were by the iniquity of their times in  
 “ a manner forcibly driven (*at least as they imagined*)

<sup>1</sup> Episcopacy by Divine Right, p. i. § 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* § 5.



“ upon this form, and necessarily put to their choice  
 “ whether they would still submit to Popery, or no  
 “ longer submit to Episcopal Administration, which  
 “ there was only managed by Popish hands.” He  
 likens the abandonment of Episcopacy in such a case,  
 to a “ mariner casting out his goods in a storm,”  
 “ cutting off a limb to prevent the deadly malignity  
 “ of a gangrene,” “ pulling down the next roof when  
 “ an house is on fire in the City;” and yet though  
 he would not take upon himself to judge others, yet  
 we see that he himself would have waited, with a  
 more constant faith, “ until the tyranny were over-  
 past,” rather than throw over with his own hands the  
 deposit committed to him. “ Fear not, thou bearest  
 Cæsar ” was thought assurance enough when the  
 storm lay vehemently upon his vessel ; much more  
 then to us, “ Fear not, thou bearest an Ordinance of  
 “ thy Lord’s ; it is thy Lord Himself ‘ asleep in the  
 “ hinder part of the ship.’ ” For in the midst of this  
 palliation of their case, Bishop Hall cannot but express  
 his own doubts, whether any plea of necessity should  
 have been admitted in such a case: “ Though also,”  
 he adds, “ it is very considerable, *whether the condition*  
 “ *they were in, doth altogether absolutely warrant such a*  
 “ *proceeding*; for was it not so with us, after Reforma-  
 “ tion was stept in, during those fiery times of Queen  
 “ Mary? Was it not so with you, when those holy  
 “ men, Patrick Hamilton, and George Wischart,  
 “ sowed the first seeds of Reformation among you  
 “ in their own blood? With that spirit the Holy

“ Ghost indued them, of patience and constancy  
 “ crowned with martyrdom, not of tumult and oppo-  
 “ sition, to the disquiet of the state and hazard of the  
 “ reformation itself; or to the abjuring and blasphem-  
 “ ing of an holy Order in the Church, and dis-  
 “ honouring of Almighty God, while they pretended to  
 “ seek His honour.” Moreover Bishop Hall only ex-  
 cuses, in a degree, those who did this upon necessity,  
 as they thought, in order the more strongly to con-  
 trast their case with that of those who did the same  
 without necessity. “ This was their case; but what  
 “ is this to your’s? Your [the Scotch] Church was  
 “ happily gone out of Babylon; your and our most  
 “ gracious and religious sovereign sincerely professeth,  
 “ maintaineth, encourageth, the blessedly-reformed  
 “ religion; his Bishops preach for it, write for it, and  
 “ profess themselves ready, after the example of their  
 “ predecessors, to bleed for it. And how can you  
 “ now think of paralleling your condition with the  
 “ foreign?” The loss of Episcopacy, when it seemed  
 for the time that it could not be had, Bishop Hall  
 looks upon with “ pity<sup>1</sup>”; its voluntary rejection he  
 entitles, “ to<sup>2</sup> cast mire in the faces of the blessed  
 “ Apostles, who received it from their God and Sa-  
 “ viour, and, by the guidance of His Spirit, ordained  
 “ it :” those who had abandoned it he “ beseeches<sup>3</sup>  
 “ and adjures by that love they profess to bear to  
 “ the truth of God, by that tender respect they bear

<sup>1</sup> Epistle dedicatory.

<sup>2</sup> P. 1. § 1.

<sup>3</sup> P. 3. § 8.

“ to the peace of His Zion, by their zeal to the Gospel  
 “ of Christ, by their main care of their happy account  
 “ one day before the tribunal of the most righteous  
 “ Judge of the quick and dead ; to lay all this that  
 “ he had said, seriously together,” and “ for God’s  
 “ sake and his own, not upon groundless suggestion  
 “ to abandon God’s truth and ordinance, and adore  
 “ an idol made of the ear-rings of the people, and  
 “ fashioned out with the graving-tool of a supposed  
 “ skilful Aaron ;” “ and for you,” he adds<sup>1</sup>, “ my  
 “ dearly beloved brethren at home, for Christ’s sake,  
 “ for the Church’s sake, for your souls’ sake, be ex-  
 “ horted to hold fast to this holy Institution of your  
 “ Blessed Saviour, and his unerring Apostles, and  
 “ bless God for Episcopacy.”

So might an aged saint write, when our evils were  
 yet fresh, and our wounds green ; but now that they  
 are thought past healing, it is to be held that they  
 are not wounds, but natural functions of the body.  
 Truth is to be held one thing in England, another  
 across the Tweed. Alas for the change, when “ the  
 holy Institution of our Blessed Saviour” is held to  
 be a thing wholly outward, and anxiety for it a sign  
 of formalism !

But the doctrine of the Apostolic succession,  
 rightly put forward, does not protect our people  
 against dissent, or Ultra-Protestantism only ; it is  
 equally a protection against Rome. And hence have

<sup>1</sup> § 9.

the agents of that Church "sought" many "false witnesses," in order to invalidate our succession and our orders; and when she has "found none" has resorted to so many frivolous pretences. For since there cannot be in the same place two successors of the Apostles, the admission that we have the Apostolical succession, must on principles which they cannot but acknowledge, altogether exclude them. Hence it has been observed <sup>1</sup>, "The objections against "the validity of the English ordinations have been "almost exclusively devised and employed by the "Romanists of England and Ireland; who having "revolted from their own Churches, resorted to every "imaginable expedient to establish their new community, *per fas et nefas*, on the ruins of the Church "of Christ. The churches of the Roman communion "were in part deceived by the artifices and falsehoods "of these men; but notwithstanding the errors and "prejudice which they created, many theologians of "that communion were fully persuaded that our "ordinations were valid."

Hence also the great displeasure, which was excited by Courayer's writing his able defence of our orders. It was objected to him at the time, "it <sup>2</sup> "interposed an obstacle to the conversion of many "English."

The Apostolical succession then is not an abstract argument, but a tangible fact, the value of which

<sup>1</sup> Palmer on the Church, pt. vi. c. 10. t. ii. p. 452.

<sup>2</sup> Le Quien ap. Palmer, l. c. p. 451.



any plain man can feel. Any one can understand that our LORD promised to be with the Apostles and with their successors to the end of the world ; nor do any other even claim to be the successors of the original Bishops of our Church, who were ordained by Apostles or Apostolic men, except those who now fill those sees, the Bishops of the Anglo-Catholic Church. The Romanist Bishops were but of yesterday, nor do they even pretend to be Bishops of our sees : they assume only to be Bishops *in partibus infidelium* ; among us they are only the delegates of the Bishop of Rome. And thus they acknowledge themselves schismatics : the Romish communion in this country has, as well as the dissenters, separated itself from those who have received their Commission from the Head of the Church. To quote again the tranquil and learned writer just cited <sup>1</sup>. “The Romish party  
 “in these countries committed schism in separating  
 “from the communion of the Church, and the obedience of their legitimate pastors, in the reign of  
 “Elizabeth. It is certain, that during the reigns of  
 “Henry VIII. and his successors, until the eleventh  
 “year of Queen Elizabeth’s reign, there were not  
 “two separate communions and worships in England.  
 “All the people were subject to the same pastors,  
 “attended the same churches, and received the same  
 “sacraments. It was only about 1570 that the  
 “Romish party, at the instigation of foreign emissaries, separated itself and fell from the Catholic

<sup>1</sup> Palmer, pt. ii. c. 6. § 11. “The Romish Sect schismatic.”

“ Church of England.”—“ A society formed in this  
 “ manner, by voluntary separation from a Church of  
 “ Christ, was totally cut off from the unity of the  
 “ Catholic Church; nor is it to be alleged in reply,  
 “ that the new community was recognized by the  
 “ Roman Bishops and some of the Western Churches;  
 “ for this only proves that the Roman Bishops en-  
 “ couraged schism, and the other Churches were mis-  
 “ led by their excessive veneration for the Roman See,  
 “ and by the misrepresentations of the enemies of the  
 “ Church of England; therefore their sanction to the  
 “ new community, being given on erroneous informa-  
 “ tion, could not afford any justification of it.

“ It is evident then, that the whole separation or  
 “ schism was originated and effected by the Roman  
 “ pontiffs and their adherents, not by the Churches  
 “ among us. I repeat it, as a fact which ought never  
 “ to be forgotten, that WE DID NOT GO OUT FROM  
 “ THEM, but, as the Apostle says, THEY WENT OUT  
 “ FROM US, thus bearing what is, as Bossuet well  
 “ observes, the invariable mark of schism and heresy  
 “ in every age: ‘ Non enim nos ab illis, sed illi a  
 “ nobis recesserunt.’

“ Hence it follows that the Romish communities  
 “ in England are not Churches of Christ; and we  
 “ have an additional proof of this in the fact, that  
 “ they were unable to show any succession of the  
 “ episcopacy in their conventicles. The Pope indeed  
 “ sent a titular bishop to them in 1625, whose suc-  
 “ cessor went to France in 1629, and returned no

set in array our union with the Ancient Primitive Church against their greater extent of actual Communion; the Catholicity of descent against the Pseudo-Catholicity of usurped and corrupted dominion; the Catholicity of agreement with quod semper, quod ab omnibus, quod ubique traditum est, against the Pseudo-Catholicity of modern corruptions; Apostolic succession against the claim of one universal Episcopacy; our union through continued succession with our Invisible Head, against the union with the one supposed visible head: we must show our people that all which they would seek for in Rome, they may find in the Church wherein they were baptized, if they will but study her character and avail themselves of their privileges; that it be not said of us, when too late, “*felices nimium sua si bona norint!*” “If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace.” Else will they search in the schismatic communion of Rome among us, and think that they will there find, what they had in their own Church and knew it not.

To close this subject in the words of Bishop Stillingfleet<sup>1</sup>;—“Three ways, Bishop Sanderson observes our dissenting brethren, though not intentionally and purposely, yet really and eventually, have been the great promoters of the Roman interest among us; (1) by *putting-to their helping hand to the pulling down of Episcopacy* . . . . .

<sup>1</sup> Unreasonableness of separation; Pref. quoted Catena, No. 1. Tracts, No. 74. p. 26.

“ (2) by opposing the interest of Rome with more violence than reason ; (3) by frequently mistaking the question, but especially through the necessity of some false principle or other, which having once imbibed, they think themselves bound to maintain, whatever becomes of the common cause of our reformation.”

I have now, my Lord, gone through all the subjects expressly treated upon in the “Tracts,” which have been regarded by those of an ultra-Protestant school, as approximating to Popery ; and I have shown, I trust, that we, together with our Church, hold a distinct and tangible line, removed from modern novelties, whether of Rome or Ultra-Protestantism. In the main outlines, the views which we have put forth as those of our Church, will be familiar to your Lordship, as those of the standard Divines of our Church : we wish to set forth no new doctrines ; we would only revive what circumstances connected with the sin of 1688 have thrown into a partial oblivion ; we appeal to the formularies of our Church as interpreted by our standard Divines, and agreeing with the best and purest ages. These, as the very titles of our Tracts convey, have been the main topics, upon which we dwelt<sup>1</sup> ; we wished to

<sup>1</sup> Thus the two first Volumes were divided into (1) Liturgical, (2) on Ordinances, (3) on the Apostolic Succession, (4) on the Doctrine of the Church, (5) on the History of the Church, (6) Records of the Church, to which, in the first, were added some tracts explaining, (7) the Argument for the Church.



put forth no *system* of Divinity; what we wrote were "Tracts for the Times," *i.e.* on such topics as the times seemed to stand in especial need of; they were to fill up the lacunæ of a popular system, to recall to men's minds forgotten or depreciated truths, to invite them to enlarge or correct or modify their systems by the consideration of points upon which they had not hitherto dwelt,—“the Holy Catholic Church,” (our belief of which we daily confess,) and the Ordinances of her LORD, committed to her keeping, whether His Sacraments, or rites, practices, and observances, (such as fasting, Ember days,) which she has ever observed, and which are essential to her well-being; her apostolic succession; her public prayer; her holy days and seasons; or the character of the Liturgy, in which so much of her doctrine is embodied. Occasionally, other topics have been dwelt upon, and defects have been pointed out either in the great rival system of Rome<sup>1</sup>, or in the popular way of treating our own<sup>2</sup>. But the great object which runs through the whole was to bring up

<sup>1</sup> No. 27, 28. Bishop Cosin's History of Popish Transubstantiation; 71. on the Controversy with the Romanists; 72. Archbishop Usher's prayers for the dead, not connected with Purgatory; 79. on Purgatory.

<sup>2</sup> No. 73. "On the Introduction of rationalistic principles into religion," (against explaining the mysteries of the Faith, through viewing them simply as they operate upon man). No. 80. "On reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge," (against indiscriminately obtruding religious knowledge on minds unfit to receive it, "casting pearls before swine").

men's practice to the standard of their Church, AS IT IS; to remove ill-founded objections to it<sup>1</sup>, to develop to them points, which they had not apparently considered; to realize more the system, in which we actually live, to live up to what we have.

Such was our object; and such topics (as any will have seen who has watched the nature of the attacks upon us,) have been until very lately, the exclusive subjects of censure. The "heresy" of Baptismal regeneration, its supposed connection with the "opus operatum" of Rome, or its variance from their view of justification; the supposed austerity of the repentance insisted on; imagined asceticism, confounded with the penance of the Church of Rome; the uncharitableness of maintaining Apostolic succession or its formality; or the high sense of the mysteriousness and sacredness of the Holy Eucharist; these were the exclusive topics of controversy.

The topics above dwelt upon are parts of the entire Catholic system; none of them stand insulated; they run into each other, and modify our faith or practice; "the Holy Catholic Church," and "the forgiveness of sins," or the "One Baptism for the remission of sins," enter among the few articles of the Creed. It is obvious from the very character of the controversy which was raised, that the mode of man's justification before God, the character and

<sup>1</sup> As in No. 13. Principle of selection of Sunday Lessons; 3. on Alterations in the Liturgy; 9. and 43. on Shortening it; 22. on the Athanasian Creed, &c.

“ more ; and up to the present time the Romish  
 “ community has not had any bishops, for although  
 “ the vicars-apostolic (as they call themselves) pre-  
 “ tend to the episcopal character, this character is by  
 “ no means essential to their office ; their successors  
 “ may be priests or monks, and they have no ordi-  
 “ nary power over the English Romanists, being  
 “ merely deputies of the Roman Pontiff, who may  
 “ revoke their commissions, without any trial, at his  
 “ own will and pleasure. Consequently as vicars-  
 “ apostolic they have no episcopal jurisdiction in  
 “ England ; and as titular bishops, ‘ *in partibus infi-*  
 “ *delium,*’ they have no jurisdiction any where. There-  
 “ fore they are not, properly speaking, bishops ; and  
 “ the Romanists of England are devoid of any apos-  
 “ tolical succession of bishops, not to speak of some  
 “ serious difficulties which affect the validity of their  
 “ orders<sup>1</sup> in these countries, and which will be con-  
 “ sidered elsewhere.”

“ The singularity of one pastor in each place, de-  
 “ scended from the Apostles and their scholars by a  
 “ perpetual succession,” to use Bp. Bilson’s words,  
 has been uniformly recognized by all Churches in  
 the world. The only exception allowed has been  
 where the nations speaking different languages are  
 united in the same city, in which case each was  
 allowed to have the blessing of a Bishop, whose

<sup>1</sup> The consecrations of their earlier Bishops by one Bishop,  
 which many among themselves account invalid. Ib. pt. vi.  
 c. xi.

language they could understand<sup>1</sup>. Otherwise it was a principle acknowledged by the universal Church, and formally ratified by the Council at Nice, that in one place there could be but one Bishop. "One God, One Christ, One Bishop<sup>2</sup>," was the exclamation of the Roman people, when the Emperor proposed to them to have two Bishops to govern the Church in common. "We are not ignorant," says Cornelius<sup>3</sup> to St. Cyprian, that "as there is One God, One Christ the Lord, Whom we have confessed, One Holy Spirit, so there ought to be One Bishop in a Catholic Church." There can be but one representative of the Chief Shepherd in one place. "There<sup>4</sup> can be but one Bishop in a Church at a time, and one Judge as Vicegerent of Christ." "Since<sup>5</sup> there can be no second after the first, who ever is made after him who ought to be alone, is not a second Bishop, but is none." Whence the Martyr St. Cyprian designates such an appointment as "setting<sup>6</sup> up a profane altar, erecting an adulterous chair, offering sacrilegious sacrifices against the true Priest."

Again then, my Lord, the doctrine of the Apostolic succession, so far from having any connection

<sup>1</sup> This justifies the appointment of an English Bishop in Paris.

<sup>2</sup> Theodoret, v. 3. quoted by Bingham, ii. 13. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. 46. al. 49. quoted *ib.*

<sup>4</sup> Cyprian, ep. 55. al. 59. ad Cornel. quoted *ib.*

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. *ib.*

<sup>6</sup> Ep. 67. al. 68. ad Steph. *ib.*



with Romanism, is a bulwark against it. The Romanists account the promises to St. Peter to be confined to their single see; the Anglo-Catholics, with the Primitive Church, that they are inherited by the Bishops universally; Rome has in her corrupt days ever essayed to intrench on the independent authority of Bishops as of Churches; she would have them derive their authority mediately through her existing Bishop, not, together with her Bishop, from the One Bishop. The doctrine of the Apostolic succession involves our independence from the undue authority of Rome. Whatever priority of dignity there may be, the Bishop of the smallest city is as much the representative of the Chief-Bishop as the Patriarch of the greatest.

But, besides this, the argument which the Romanists so frequently urge, to take "the safer side," is thus found to be on the side of our own Church. It is indeed the bounden duty of any man, in dubious cases, to take the safer side, *i. e.* that which seems more likely to have the favour of GOD; but the "safer side" is not with those who deny him the "Blood" of CHRIST, "which is shed for many for the remission of sins;" the "safer side" is not with those who forsake those whom He has appointed to succeed His Apostles in this Church, and with whom He has promised to be; the "safest side" is not with those who "form divisions among us," and whom the Apostle has given us this mark "to avoid." The "safest side" is that so feelingly urged by the good Bishop

Hall<sup>1</sup>. “Let me therefore confidently shut up all  
 “with that resolute word of that blessed Martyr and  
 “Saint, Ignatius—‘Let all things be done to the  
 “honour of God; give respect to your bishop, as  
 “you would God should respect you. My soul for  
 “their’s, who obey their bishop, presbyter and dea-  
 “cons; God grant that my portion may be the same  
 “with their’s.’” “And let my soul,” adds the pious  
 Bishop, “have the same share with the blessed  
 Martyr that said so.”

No, my Lord! they again little know where our  
 Church’s “great strength lies,” who would have us  
 ungratefully give up our Apostolic origin; it is a  
 portion of GOD’s truth; the birthright which He gave  
 us; and whoso is ashamed of any portion of GOD’s  
 truth, of him will God be ashamed; our Church, if  
 she profanely despise her birthright, may afterwards  
 “find no place for repentance, though she seek  
 it carefully with tears.” Rome comes to us with  
 high pretensions; true that many of them are but  
 “art and man’s device,” many but the corruptions  
 of the truth; seen by the side of the truth, the  
 counterfeit will be evident; but if we withdraw the  
 truth committed to us, it will pass for gold. There  
 is much in the system of Rome to engage imagina-  
 tive and ardent minds; and if the corresponding  
 truth which we have, is hidden from sight, they will  
 embrace it, although painfully feeling the error  
 wherewith in that Church it is mingled. We must

<sup>1</sup> Episcopacy by Divine Right, conclusion.

sight, "judgment to come" as well as the "resurrection of the body." The world, now as in Homer's time, thinks of them as ἀμενηνὰ κάθηνα, compassionates them as inactive, and withdrawn from *their* world, despises or forgets them. Our Church, in contrast to all these, cherishes their memory; blesses GOD for them<sup>1</sup>; thinks of them as "resting in Christ<sup>2</sup>," and of their "spirits" as "living with God in joy and felicity<sup>2</sup>," yet desires "their's and "our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body "and soul, in His eternal and everlasting glory<sup>2</sup>." She holds "all who depart hence in the Lord," to be "in peace and at rest," and this was held by the Ancient Church also, and, as being inconsistent with Purgatory, is the very point of divergence from Rome<sup>3</sup>, she regards them as in a state of, as yet, imperfect happiness, and so differs from the Ultra-Protestant; and in both, her view coincides with the prayers of the Ancient Church, which speak of those departed as at rest, yet pray "that God would show them "mercy, and hasten the resurrection, and give a "blessed sentence in the great day." So that although, for the safety of her children, she relinquished the practice, her doctrine is in accordance with it. And certainly, it is of much importance that this should be rightly understood, for as Archbishop Usher observed, "Our Romanists do com-

<sup>1</sup> Prayer for the Church Militant.

<sup>2</sup> Burial Service.

<sup>3</sup> Bishop Taylor, Dissuasive from Popery, c. 1. sect. 4. Archbishop Usher, Answer to a Jesuit, c. 7. § 2. &c. Bishop Bull, Sermon 3. and Corruptions of the Church of Rome, t. ii. p. 260.

“monly take it for granted, that purgatory and  
 “prayer for the dead be so closely linked together,  
 “that the one doth necessarily imply the other.” It  
 is the wisdom of their controversialists <sup>1</sup> so to bind  
 up the ancient practice with the modern corruption,  
 that they should seem to be really blended together;  
 it is our’s to show them to be distinct; else are we  
 enlisting man’s natural and dutiful veneration for  
 Antiquity on the side of Rome, and ourselves mis-  
 leading them, and tempting them to abandon us.  
 Those who condemn *all* prayers for CHRIST’s departed  
 servants, as Popish, are doing Rome an honour which  
 she little deserves, and making her out in this respect  
 to be primitive, instead of the corrupter of primitive  
 practice.

In another point of view—if “to pray for the dead  
 was the dictate of human nature<sup>2</sup>,” as well as the  
 practice of the Primitive Church—and no one, prob-  
 ably, who has observed himself, will doubt this—it  
 is surely putting the members of our Church in a  
 needlessly disadvantageous position, to teach them  
 that our Church proscribes such prayer, that it is not  
 to be had but in Romanism.

Why narrow thus what our Church has left unde-  
 fined? why, if when our Church prays that GOD would

<sup>1</sup> In a recent popular book, by Dr. Rock, professing to illus-  
 trate the Romanist doctrines from monuments of ancient art, is a  
 chapter on Purgatory; yet there is not an approximation to the  
 doctrine of Purgatory in any one inscription cited; nothing be-  
 yond the primitive character of prayer for the departed saints.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Short’s Hist. of English Church, § 15.



“give us grace so to follow their good examples, that “*with them*, we may be partakers of His heavenly “kingdom,” any think that she longs for *their* “final “consummation in bliss” also, should any one seek to hinder it? or if any, understanding in a primitive sense a primitive prayer, “most humbly beseeching “Thee to grant that by the merits and Passion of Thy “Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, “we and *all Thy whole Church* may obtain remission “of our sins, and *all other benefits of His Passion*,” should think that those emphatic words, “*all thy whole Church*,” were not to be restrained to the Church militant, but included that portion of the Church also, which is at rest, and prayed that they also might enjoy such “benefits of His Passion,” as belonged to their state of rest, why should he be hindered<sup>1</sup>? Surely, both wisdom and charity require that we should not narrow our pale, nor proscribe a practice of the primitive Church, even though wisdom and charity prevent its formal restoration. A formal restoration would, in the corrupt state of modern manners, probably lower still further the standard of holiness; men would probably abuse these prayers as a ground of carnal security, and, by a worse corruption than that of Rome, look to them as available for those *not* “departed hence in the faith and fear of God.” In order to have with impunity all primitive

<sup>1</sup> So again in the Burial Service, “that we *with all those* that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation,” &c.

ordinances, we must have also primitive purity and primitive discipline. To restore privileges before we restore strictness of life, were to begin at the wrong end. But our Church, as has recently been in a very elaborate sentence decided <sup>1</sup>, condemns not *such* prayers, and why should we take upon ourselves to pronounce, where she has thought it most becoming to be silent, or restrain the liberty, which she has left unfettered?

*Invocation of Saints.*

There is however another subject ordinarily connected with this (though in truth not very naturally) upon which our Church has not been silent, "Invocation of the departed saints," and it is not without some amazement, even with continued experience of the carelessness of controversy, that I find it supposed that we have on this point contravened the direct teaching of our Church, I can scarcely adequately represent to your Lordship how much care was taken to prevent any mistakes upon the subject, or how strange the mis-statements which have been made. In brief, they consist in representing us as approving that which was in the Tracts directly condemned. The case was this: on several grounds it was thought useful to translate a portion of the Breviary; such were the following <sup>2</sup>, "to claim whatever *is good and true*" "in those devotions for the Church Catholic in oppo-

<sup>1</sup> The office of the Judge promoted in *Brecks v. Woolfrey*, given fully in the *Brit. Mag.* vol. xv. p. 91.

<sup>2</sup> Tracts, No. 75. p. 1, 2.

importance of the works done by and in him, repentance, future judgment, the mode of man's union with CHRIST, and His indwelling in man; the fruits of the mystery of our Blessed LORD's Incarnation; the Communion of Saints; man's relation to His Redeemer, not as an isolated being, but as a member of "the Church, which is His Body;" the universality of Divine grace: or, to take another class, the character of Schism; the duty of submission or independence of individual Christians; the mode of extending the influence of the Gospel; the duty of receiving articles of faith, without perceiving their bearing upon practice; these and many more are affected by the way in which the subjects thus dwelt upon are determined.

Of late, however, as the conflict has thickened, other ground has been occupied and other weapons been employed; and on these subjects also I must offer some explanation to your Lordship, premising only that these on the contrary were topics, insulated in themselves, and in no case insisted upon, or inculcated by us, but, at most, simply introduced in the course of treating upon other subjects. The two subjects to which I refer are "prayers for God's departed saints," and "celibacy." With the former of these has strangely been united, that of Invocation of the Saints, contrary to the express and careful teaching of the Tracts.

*Prayers for those departed in the faith and fear of God.*

I have said that this subject was mentioned by us incidentally ; I would add, that in whatever degree it has been brought into notice, has been through the diligence of those who blame us, not by ourselves. "Prayers for God's departed saints," as I have already stated more at length, were, in the first instance, simply noticed historically <sup>1</sup>, as one of the points, in which all the ancient Liturgies agreed, as also that they did in others, such as "the Kiss of Peace," and the hymn "Therefore with Angels and Archangels," &c. No stress was laid upon the fact ; no observation made, except that such prayers had been "excluded from the English ritual;" (others which had just been named having been retained;) the subject of the tract in which this mention of it occurred was wholly different, on the consecration and oblation of the Holy Eucharist : there was no hint of regret at its exclusion ; much less any desire of its restoration. It was, apparently, only mentioned, because from the nature of the argument it could not be avoided.

I have said this, my Lord, because I freely confess that I should myself think it inexpedient to bring forward such a topic in public discussion ; it is a matter of sacred consolation to those who feel themselves justified in entertaining it ; a solemn privilege

<sup>1</sup> Tracts, No. 63.



to the mourner ; but not, after that (in consequence of abuses connected with it in the Romish system,) it had been withdrawn from our Church, to be rashly and indiscriminately revived. Those, who acknowledge it as in itself justified by primitive practice, are content that our Church has placed no restriction upon its private use by her sons ; she has no where blamed it ; though those once in authority in her withdrew it, (against their earlier judgment, and as matter of practical wisdom only,) from her public services. It must from its very nature be of too solemn a character, and too connected with feelings of sacred sorrow, to be gratuitously brought out of its resting-place, the hearts of those, whose friends are lost out of sight.

An opponent <sup>1</sup>, two years past, to serve a temporary and local purpose, drew it out of the obscurity in which it lay, and, on that occasion, I showed <sup>2</sup> that it was neither connected with the doctrine of purgatory, nor new in the later English Church, having been justified, or employed by such Divines, as Bishop Andrews, Bull, Collier, Dean Field, (I might have added, Archbishop Usher, Bishop Taylor, and Barrow,) as well as by a living writer, who could not be accused of any Romanist tendency ; that it was disconnected from Purgatory even by Bucer and

<sup>1</sup> The author of the " Pastoral Epistle from the Pope, to some members of the University of Oxford."

<sup>2</sup> Earnest Remonstrance to the author of the Pope's Pastoral Letter, &c. p. 18, sqq.

Calvin, when objecting to it, as it stood in our first reformed Liturgy. Since that time, neither in tracts, nor sermons, orally, or in writing, have we any way inculcated it; and the late publicity, which the topic has acquired, has been independent of us. We are aware that our Church does not encourage it; we are satisfied that she does not discourage it; she discourages only such prayers, as the Romanists use, which are connected with the modern doctrine of Purgatory, not those of the Primitive Church, which, as have been shown by Archbishop Usher and others, are opposed to that doctrine.

Here also, my Lord, we would contend that our Church keeps her “*via media* ;” both Romanist and Ultra-Protestant dogmatize about the state of departed souls; the Romanist, following a natural instinct of human nature, decides that almost all souls undergo a painful purification after death, by which “*Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni* <sup>1</sup>.” The Ultra-Protestant, supposing all sins to be absolutely hidden and covered by the imputation of CHRIST’S righteousness, decides as peremptorily that the departed saints are already in *full* possession of the joys of heaven; he conceives of them as already “like the angels of God in heaven;” he speaks of the “joys of Heaven” as already bestowed upon them: consistently with his theory, he leaves out of

<sup>1</sup> Æn. vi. 742.

" sition to the Roman Church, whose only real claim  
 " above other Churches is that of having adopted into  
 " the Service certain additions and novelties, ascer-  
 " tainable to be such in history, as well as being cor-  
 " ruptions doctrinally." (2) To illustrate our own  
 Prayer-book as being taken from it; (3) to suggest  
 matter for our *private* devotions; (4) to "impress a  
 " truer sense of the excellence and profitableness of  
 " the Psalms, than it is the fashion of this age to  
 " entertain;" (5) by showing the corruptions to be of  
 a later date, to add one more "fact, discriminating  
 " and separating off the Roman from the Primitive  
 " Church." It was observed again that "these <sup>1</sup> por-  
 " tions of the Breviary" [the invocations to the Virgin  
 and other Saints] "carry with them their own plain  
 " condemnation in the judgment of an English Christ-  
 " ian; no commendation of the general structure and  
 " matter of the Breviary itself will have any tendency  
 " to reconcile him to them; and it has been the  
 " strong feeling that this is really the case, that has  
 " led the writer of these pages fearlessly and se-  
 " curely to admit the real excellencies, and to dwell  
 " upon the antiquity of the Roman ritual. He has  
 " felt, that since the Romanists required an unquali-  
 " fied assent to the *whole* of the Breviary, and that  
 " there were passages, which no Anglican could  
 " ever admit, praise *the true Catholic portion* of it as  
 " much as he might, he did not in the slightest de-

<sup>1</sup> Ib. p. 8.

“gree approximate to a recommendation of Romanism.” This however was not all; for after distinguishing the different parts of these corrupt additions, it was said that even those least objectionable, “*now* do but sanction and encourage that direct worship of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, which is the great practical offence of the Latin Church, and *so are a serious evil.*” Then it was pointed out that the oldest of these forms were the least objectionable, and were of a different kind from those now common in the Roman Church; still though “*more* could be said *towards* their justification than for those other addresses,” they “*are now,*” it was said, “a serious evil;” it was not said that they could be *justified*, much less were they recommended; it was only said that *more* could be said *towards* it; but that they were “a serious evil.” Having, as it would seem, thus guarded against all possibility of mistake, the writer of this Tract proceeded to translate whole portions of the Breviary, as it stands, exhibiting together both the true Catholic portion and the Romanist additions, but referring back in almost every case to the pages of the preface in which these had been thus decidedly condemned. Now it will scarcely seem credible, my Lord, that the sole foundation for the allegation, that we “*advocate* prayers to the saints,” are those very extracts from the Breviary in which they are so manifoldly condemned; that because we would “reappropriate to the Catholic Church, in opposition to the Roman Church,” “the true Catholic portion” of the



Breviary, (which the Romanists have never entrusted their people with in their own tongue,) therefore it is asserted that we would reappropriate those very prayers which we distinguish from it : that when we speak of the *least* of these corruptions as a “ serious evil,” we would wish to “ reappropriate” the *greatest* as a “ treasure<sup>1</sup>.” But neither is this the whole extent of the misrepresentation ; for in another Tract in the same volume, to which the attention could not but be called, as it was expressly “ on the

<sup>1</sup> “ The 75th number of the Tracts for the Times is composed “ of selections from the Romish Breviary, prepared and recommended for Protestant use ; in the preface to which the editor “ says, ‘ our adversaries have in this, as in many other instances, “ appropriated to themselves a treasure ’ [viz. ‘ the true Catholic portion,’ see above, p. 193] which was our’s as much as their’s. The “ publication then of these selections is, as it were, an act of ‘ reappropriation.’ And among these prayers thus reappropriated to “ Protestant use, we find the following,” [whereon follows one of the class, p. 61. which had been *expressly* designated as “ a serious evil ” and two others, which fell under the same class.] “ Prayers for “ the dead, and prayers to the Saints are both advocated” [whereon follows a hymn, of which it is yet noted in the very margin, “ It is “ remarkable, that this hymn, which is the only one of those here “ translated, which *savours of Romanism*, is the only one, except “ one other, which is not known to be ancient ;” so that the translator again remarks the coincidence of Romish corruption and absence of proof of antiquity], Essays, p. 289. Another writer says “ *the whole* is declared in the preface, to be a ‘ reappropriation of a “ treasure, which had long been lost.’ ” Fraser, p. 23 ; and yet this same writer in the next page refers to the Tract in which “ invocation of the saints ” is mentioned among the “ chief points to be urged in controversy with Rome.”

Controversy with the Romanists," "the invocation of saints" is mentioned among "the<sup>1</sup> practical grievances " to which Christians are subjected in the Roman " Communion, and which *should be put in the fore-ground*, in this controversy." The grounds also taken in that Tract are so decided, that it may be satisfactory to transcribe what is said on this head<sup>2</sup>.

" 6. The Invocation of Saints. Here again the "*practice* should be considered, not the *theory*. Scripture speaks clearly and solemnly about Christ as " the sole Mediator. When prayer to the Saints is " recommended *at all times and places*, as ever present " guardians, and their good works pleaded in God's " sight, is not this such an infringement upon the " plain word of God, such a violation of our allegiance " to our only Saviour, as must needs be an insult to " Him? His honour He will not give to another. " Can we with a safe conscience do it? Should we act " thus in a parallel case even with an earthly friend? " Does not St. John's example warn us against falling " down before angels? Does not St. Paul warn us " against a voluntary humility and worshipping of " angels? And are not these texts *indications* of " God's will, which ought to guide our conduct? Is " it not *safest* not to pay them this extraordinary " honour? As an illustration of what I mean, I will " quote the blessing pronounced by the Pope on the " assembled people at Easter :—

<sup>1</sup> No. 71. p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. p. 13, 14.

“ The holy Apostles Peter and Paul, from whom has been derived our power and authority, themselves intercede for us to the Lord. Amen.

“ For the prayers and righteous deeds of the blessed Mary, ever Virgin, of the blessed Michael the Archangel, of the blessed John the Baptist, of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and of all the saints, Almighty God have mercy upon you, and Jesus Christ absolve you from all your sins, and bring you to life everlasting. Amen.

“ The Almighty and merciful Lord grant to you pardon, absolution, and remission of all your sins, time for true and fruitful penitence, an ever penitent heart, and amendment of life, the grace and comfort of the Holy Ghost, and final perseverance in good works. Amen.

“ And the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, come down upon you and remain with you always. Amen.”

Thus then, my Lord, invocations of the very kind, which the authors of the Tracts are said to recommend are instanced among the chief “ practical grievances” to which Christians in the Roman communion are subjected.

All which can be said in answer is, that though all has been condemned, a distinction has been made between the older and the more recent, between a confession “ in the presence of all saints” as well as of the congregation present, and a beseeching of the prayers of the “ blessed Michael Archangel” and “ all saints” *together* with the congregation present, and direct, *exclusive* prayers to them. None are countenanced, but it is said that the older stand on different ground. And do they not?

For since St. Paul “charged Timothy, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, *and the elect Angels,*” would it be safe to pronounce a confession “in the presence of holy angels,” anti-scriptural, especially when we know that “there is joy in the presence of the Angels of God over one sinner that repenteth?” Sin “gives occasion to the enemies of GOD to blaspheme;” why should not a person, in confessing his sins, wish to take shame to himself, and to repent of, and disown them, in the sight of all the holy beings whom he has shocked by them, as well as of men? Bishop Taylor, in his Golden Grove, has the following form: “Whatsoever they [my sins] are, &c. &c. “I call the whole court of heaven to witness that I “do sadly repent of them all, &c. ‘Lord, be Thou “merciful to me a sinner.’” And, “I have this day “in thy sight, and in the presence of all the holy “angels that attend Thee in the conversion of a sinner, made my firm resolution,” &c. and “Rejoice “over me, O ye holy angels, a great part of whose “ministry it is to rejoice at the conversion of a “sinner.”

So, again with regard to the request of their prayers *together* with those of the congregation, it is obviously of a different character from prayers *exclusively* addressed to them. For the *exclusive* address of unseen beings has an obvious tendency, at once to fall into a sort of worship; it is too like the mode in which we address Almighty GOD, to be any way safe; the *exclusive* request of their intercessions is likely at



once to constitute them intercessors, in a way different from God's servants on earth, and (which is the great practical evil of these prayers in the Roman Church,) to interfere with the Office of the Great Intercessor. The union of members of the Church who are yet in the body with those unseen, is a check upon both these dangers; it brings down the application from the character of worship; it shows that both seen and unseen saints are applied to in the same way; it lays a restraint upon the mind, and checks feelings, which might betray it into giving to the creature the honour due to the Creator alone. There is then surely a difference between the request, "therefore I beseech thee, blessed Mary, Ever Virgin, the blessed Michael Archangel, the blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all saints and *you my brethren* to pray the Lord our God for me," and such a prayer as "Holy Mary, succour the wretched, help the weak-hearted, comfort the mourners, pray for the people, interpose for the clergy, intercede for the devoted women; let all feel thy help whoso celebrate thy holy commemoration," or "Holy Mary, pray for us sinners, now and in the hour of death," which were distinguished from it. And is not good done, by showing that the more corrupt forms came in later? So at least thought Bishop Hall<sup>1</sup>, who makes just the same distinctions between

<sup>1</sup> The Old Religion, c. 14. "The newness of the Romish Invocation of saints."

ancient and modern as were here made: “Of all  
 “those errors which we reject in the Church of  
 “Rome, there is none that can plead so much show  
 “of antiquity, as this of Invocation of Saints: which  
 “yet, *as it hath been practised and defended in the*  
 “*latter times, should in vain seek either example or*  
 “*patronage amongst the ancients*; however there might  
 “be some grounds of this devotion secretly muttered,  
 “and at last expressed in panegyrick forms, yet until  
 “almost 500 years after Christ, it was not in any  
 “sort admitted into the public service. It will be  
 “easily granted that the blessed Virgin is the prime  
 “of all saints; neither could it be other than injuri-  
 “ous, that any other of that heavenly society should  
 “have the precedence of her: Now the first that  
 “brought her name into the public devotions of the  
 “Greek Church, is noted by Nicephorus, to be Petrus  
 “Gnapheus, or Fullo, a Presbyter of Bithynia, after-  
 “wards the Usurper of the See of Antioch, much  
 “about 470 years after Christ; who (though a branded  
 “heretick) found out four things (saith he) very use-  
 “ful and beneficial to the Catholick Church; whereof  
 “the last was, (Ut in omni precatone, &c.) that in  
 “every prayer the Mother of God should be named,  
 “and her divine name called upon.—And as for the  
 “Latin Church, we hear no news of this Invocation,  
 “in the public Litanies, till Gregory’s time, about  
 “some 130 years after the former.—And in the  
 “mean time some Fathers speak of it fearfully and  
 “doubtfully. Others of the Fathers have let fall

“ speeches directly bent against this Invocation.—  
 “ And those of the Ancients, that seem to speak for  
 “ it, lay grounds that overthrow it: *however it be, all*  
 “ *holy Antiquity would have both blushed and spit at*  
 “ *those forms of Invocation, which the late Clients of*  
 “ *Rome have broached to the world*; if perhaps they  
 “ speak to the Saints *tanquam deprecatores*, (vel  
 “ *potius comprecatores*) as Spalatensis yields; mov-  
 “ ing them to be competitioners with us to the throne  
 “ of grace, not properly, but improperly, as Altissio-  
 “ dore construes it: how would they have digested  
 “ that blasphemous Psalter of our Lady, imputed to  
 “ Bonaventure, and those styles of mere Deification  
 “ which are given to her: and the division of all  
 “ offices of piety to mankind, betwixt the Mother  
 “ and the Son? How had their ears glowed to hear,  
 “ Christus oravit, Franciscus exoravit, Christ prayed,  
 “ Francis prevailed? How would they have brooked  
 “ that which Ludovicus Vives freely confesses, *Multi*  
 “ *Christiani, &c.* Many Christians worship (*divos*  
 “ *divasque*) the Saints of both sexes, no otherwise  
 “ than God Himself? Or that which Spalatensis  
 “ professes to have observed, that the ignorant multi-  
 “ tude are carried with more entire religious affection  
 “ to the blessed Virgin, or some other Saint, than to  
 “ Christ their Saviour? These foul superstitions are  
 “ not more heinous than new, and such, as wherein  
 “ we have justly abhorred to take part with the prac-  
 “ tisers of them.”

But there is probably here also not mere miscon-

ception, but a real difference of habit of mind and feeling between the three views. Romanist and Ultra-Protestant are alike rigorous in opposite ways. The Romanist is not content with the persuasion that Christ's departed servants, being admitted near the Presence, and under the shadow of the throne of glory, and by the heavenly Altar<sup>1</sup>, continue the intercessions for the Church here below, which they offered while in the body; he will not rest satisfied in the assurance of God's good will to us herein; he must fain obtain to himself a personal interest in their intercessions, appropriate them to himself, make them personally his friends, and so he steps beyond Antiquity, and asks them directly to intercede for him, prays to them, makes them his Intercessors, approaches to GOD and CHRIST through them, instead of casting himself directly upon GOD's mercy in CHRIST; at last, in practice, substitutes them as Intercessors, for the One Intercessor. He begins by laying down that it is "good<sup>2</sup> and useful *suppliantly* " *to invoke them, and to flee to their prayers, aid, and* " *help* to obtain benefits from God through His Son " Jesus Christ our Lord, Who Alone is our Redeemer " and Saviour," and condemns as "*impious*, those who " deny that they are to be invoked, or assert that " the invocation of them to pray for each of us *individually*, is idolatry;" he ends by making them his

<sup>1</sup> Rev. vi. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. Trid. Sess. 25. de invocat. venerat. et reliquiis Sanctorum et sacris imaginibus.



mediators, as beings more like himself, whom he can approach with less of awe, with less earnest resolutions of holiness, less anxiety about his sins, in his own words, as "meek and mild<sup>1</sup>," and not as a "consuming fire." The Ultra-Protestant, revolted at this abuse, will not hear of their interceding at all, proscribes all thought of it, cuts himself off—not from their communion and fellowship, but from all sense of it and its blessedness; will be thankful for the prayers of weak sinners like himself, but will not feel the privilege of their prayers who are "delivered from "the burden of the flesh, and the miseries of this sinful "world," and in the abodes of love, love us more holily; is jealous of every mention of them, and so forgets them; and either restrains the doctrine of the "Communion of Saints" to the charities of this life, or makes it a mere abstract statement that all the redeemed belong to one body. Our Church, between

<sup>1</sup> "Only we shall recite a few words of Antoninus, their great "Divine and Archbishop of Florence; 'it is necessary that they, "to whom she converts her eyes, being an advocate for them, "shall be justified and saved.' And whereas it may be objected "out of John that the Apostle says, 'If any man sin, we have an "Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous,' he answers 'that Christ is not our Advocate alone but our Judge; "and since the just is scarce secure, how shall a sinner go to Him "as to an Advocate? Therefore God hath provided us an advocate, who is gentle and sweet, in whom nothing that is sharp "is to be found.'" Bp. Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*, c. 2. sect. 8; compare Mr. Froude's observations founded on their actual practice, *Remains*, t. i. p. 294. quoted Appendix, No. 91.

both, recognizes with the ancient church, the actualness of the Communion of Saints; that "God<sup>1</sup> has knit "together His elect in one communion and fellowship, "in the mystical body of His Son, Christ our Lord;" it rejoices in God's assurance<sup>2</sup>, that through "the due receiving of the holy mysteries," "we are very members incorporate in the *mystical* body of His Son, "which is the blessed company of all faithful people," and prays, that we may "continue in that holy fellowship;" weekly "blesses<sup>3</sup> His Holy Name for all His "servants departed this life in His faith and fear;" accompanies their departure from this life, with "heartly<sup>4</sup> thanks that it hath pleased Him to deliver "them out of the miseries of this sinful world;" prays God that His "holy Angels<sup>5</sup> may, by His appointment, succour and defend us on earth;" but there stops short, is content to feel the blessedness of that mystical union, and with the assurance that it must be a blessing, without intruding into that holy fellowship with selfish and unauthorized prayers to them to intercede for us individually, or approaching them with language which if they hear it, must be shocking to them, as belonging rather to their Lord.

We may then have a vivid and thankful sense of our privilege of belonging to a body, part of whom

<sup>1</sup> Collect for All Saints' Day.

<sup>2</sup> Thanksgiving after Communion.

<sup>3</sup> Prayer for the Church Militant.

<sup>4</sup> Burial Service.

<sup>5</sup> Collect for St. Michael and All Angels.

have passed through our trials, tribulations, and infirmities, and “ have been brought out of great tribulation, and washed their robes in the Blood of the “ Lamb ;” we may take comfort that they, together with their Lord, sympathise with the imperfect members of His body, and intercede for us before Him, with greater purity than our earthly friends ; we might think of it with respectful affection and gratitude ; we might thank God for it ; we might even pray Him, that they might intercede as for us, without even approximating to the errors of the Church of Rome. In a word, we might be thankful that they do intercede for us, without making them our intercessors or praying them so to do. In Origen’s beautiful language<sup>1</sup>, “ Nor doth the High Priest alone pray “ with those who pray truly, but the ‘ angels’ also ‘ in “ heaven’ who ‘ rejoice over one sinner that repenteth “ more than over ninety and nine just persons, who “ need no repentance,’ and the souls of the saints who “ fell asleep before us :—For whereas in this life “ knowledge is manifested to those accounted worthy, “ ‘ through a glass, darkly,’ but then revealed ‘ face to “ face,’ it were inconsistent if the like were not “ to be the case as to other excellencies, especially “ since what is laid up beforehand in this life is then “ really perfected. But one of the chiefest excellencies, according to the divine word, is love of our “ neighbour, which the saints, who have fallen asleep “ before us, must necessarily be supposed to have

<sup>1</sup> De Orat. § 11. t. i. p. 213, 14. ed. de la Rue.

“ much more exceedingly towards those who are yet  
 “ engaged in the strife of this life, than those who are  
 “ yet beset with human infirmity, and but helping the  
 “ weaker in a common strife. Not here alone does bro-  
 “ therly love fulfil that saying, ‘ if one member suffer,  
 “ all the members suffer with it, and if one member  
 “ be honoured, all the members rejoice with it.’  
 “ For it beseemeth well the love of those who have  
 “ departed this present life, to say ‘ the care of all  
 “ the Churches ;—who is weak, and I am not weak ?  
 “ who is offended, and I burn not ?’ and the more,  
 “ when Christ professeth that He is sick in each of  
 “ the sick saints ; and in like way, that He is in  
 “ prison also, and naked, and both a stranger and  
 “ hungered and a-thirst ; for who of those who read  
 “ the Gospel knoweth not that Christ, ascribing to  
 “ Himself the things which befall believers, account-  
 “ eth them as His own sufferings ? And if the angels  
 “ of God, coming to Jesus, ministered to Him, and it  
 “ were not fitting to conceive of this ministry of the  
 “ angels about Jesus, as restricted to the brief period  
 “ of His bodily sojourn among men, when He was  
 “ among believers, ‘ not as he that sitteth at meat,  
 “ but as he that serveth,’ how many angels, think  
 “ you, minister to Jesus, Who willeth to bring toge-  
 “ ther the children of Israel one by one, and collect  
 “ them from the dispersion, and saveth those who fear  
 “ and call upon Him !—for not in vain do ‘ the angels  
 “ of God ascend and descend upon the Son of man,’  
 “ being seen by the eyes enlightened by the light of



“ true knowledge ; yea, the angel of each, even of  
 “ the ‘ little ones ’ in the Church, ‘ always beholding  
 “ the face of the Father Who is in heaven,’ and con-  
 “ templating the Divinity of Him Who created us,  
 “ prayeth together with us, and worketh together in  
 “ such things which we pray for, as admit thereof.”

I have dwelt upon this topic, because some of the *more* ancient forms which have been objected to, *may* express nothing more than this consciousness, that the saints at rest do pray for us, and so help us by their prayers. The words “ *intercedentibus omnibus sanctis*,” *need* mean no more than this ; nor *need* the words “ whose<sup>1</sup> deeds of grace working together with our prayers,” mean more than St. Paul means, when he says<sup>2</sup>, “ I fill up that which is behind of “ the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for His body’s “ sake which is the Church.” Practically, what was said more than excluded the use of any of these forms ; they were spoken of as, practically, “ a serious evil ;” yet it is wise, as well as charitable, not to interpret what *may* be innocent, by later usages which are not so, nor to do Rome the service of carrying up her corruptions into ages which knew not of them, by putting the same glosses upon their words which she would. The liability of their being misunderstood should preclude our using them ; yet ought we not ourselves to misunderstand or misinterpret them.

<sup>1</sup> Essays, p. 289.

<sup>2</sup> Col. i. 24.

*Celibacy.*

There yet remains one specific charge, which is to prove an inclination towards the Romanist system, the praise of celibacy. It is urged as an objection, that we do not put forward "the celibacy of the clergy" among "the chief grounds of difference between ourselves and the Church of Rome," and that "Monasticism and celibacy are counselled and recommended in some passages." At the same time it is admitted that these passages cannot be altogether adduced as speaking our sentiments, inasmuch as "several of" us "are married clergymen<sup>1</sup>."

And, first, I may state to your Lordship, that no where in the Tracts have there been put forth any recommendations whether of celibacy in general, or that of the Clergy in particular. It has not been inculcated, nor even been named in the Tracts; and what has been elsewhere said by any who have written in the Tracts, has been dropped incidentally; there has been nothing of systematic promotion of this state. Then, also, when mentioned, it has been with reference to specific cases, to provide for especial needs<sup>2</sup>, such as where St. Paul says "on account of

<sup>1</sup> Essays, p. 291, 2.

<sup>2</sup> The passages quoted are Brit. Mag. vol. ix. p. 366. "You must have dissent or monachism in a Christian country: so make your choice." Ib. p. 368. "Great towns will never be evangelized merely by the parochial system; *they are beyond the sphere of the parish priest*, burdened as he is with the endearments and anxieties of a family." Froude's Remains, t. i. p. 322. "It has

the present distress ;” or as a way more excellent in itself, as one of the triumphs of Faith, not as being generally expedient or desirable, even among the clergy. And herein, at once a distinction is made between the teaching of these writers and that of the Church of Rome, which absolutely requires it of her priests ; and it appears also how far they are from advocating views in a proselytizing, or party spirit.

With regard to the subject itself, I may perhaps the less scruple to speak, as belonging to that class, who, it is admitted, from the circumstances of their own life, cannot be disposed either to underrate the blessings of marriage, or unduly to exalt the celibate. I own then, my Lord, I cannot read such passages, as, “There  
 “ be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs  
 “ for the kingdom of heaven’s sake ; he that is able  
 “ to receive it, let him receive it.” “Verily, I say unto  
 “ you that there is no man who hath left father or  
 “ mother, or wife or children for My Name’s sake,  
 “ but he shall receive manifold more in this present  
 “ life, and in the world to come life everlasting.” “He  
 “ that standeth steadfast in his heart, having no ne-

“ lately come into my head that the *present state* of things in Eng-  
 “ land makes an opening for reviving the monastic system.” He continued ; “ I think of putting the view forward under the title  
 “ of ‘ Project for reviving religion in great towns.’ Certainly,  
 “ colleges of unmarried priests, (who *might* of course *retire to a*  
 “ *living, when they could, and liked*) would be the cheapest possi-  
 “ ble way of *providing for the spiritual wants* of a large popula-  
 “ tion.”

“cessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath  
 “so decreed in his heart, that he will keep his virgin  
 “doeth well; so then he that giveth her in marriage  
 “doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage  
 “doeth better.”—I cannot read these and others  
 without acknowledging, that, though marriage is not  
 permitted only, but “honourable,” yea, our Lord  
 honoured the marriage rite by His Presence and by  
 His beginning of miracles, and has consecrated it into  
 a mystery and an image of the Church’s union with  
 Him, still “a more excellent way,” is pointed out to  
 “those, to whom it is given.” Marriage has not only  
 safety, but honour. Changed as its character is by the  
 fall, in that it now gives birth to a tainted offspring,  
 yet, that men might not despise it, and thence make  
 a snare to themselves, GOD has restored it to a  
 portion of the dignity which it had from His institu-  
 tion in Paradise, dignified it in the Patriarchs, set  
 forth an example of it in “Abraham His friend,” and  
 in the pure blessings of Isaac, made its mutual love  
 a similitude of that which He bears to His Church,  
 and of her reverence to Him, her Head and Saviour;  
 hallowed it yet more, in that His Son was born of  
 the seed of David, according to the flesh, though not  
 after the flesh, and His Ever-Virgin Mother was be-  
 trothed, when He “abhorred not the Virgin’s womb,”  
 and He appointed that mothers should be “saved by  
 the Childbearing;” He takes us by the hand, and  
 hallows our union by the blessing of His Church; so  
 that what man might have feared to approach, is,



when “enterprised reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God,” a continual image and representation of things holy and Divine.

But it is the very character of the Faith, that, while it ennobles the use of God’s permitted blessing, it points out to those who can receive it, a higher way, by foregoing them. Thus, it declares “every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, “if it be received with thanksgiving,” and it consecrates it to our use “by the word of God and by Prayer,” yet it shows “a more excellent way” by fasting, which “He who seeth in secret, shall reward “openly:” it teaches that “our lands are in our own power,” yet it promises “manifold more to those “who forsake houses and lands for His Name’s sake “and the Gospel’s:” it teaches to “lie down in “peace and sleep in Him, Who maketh us to dwell in “safety,” yet those who are able, it invites to be like their Lord, and “watch unto prayer,” to “prevent the “nights watches,” or even to “spend the night in “prayer to God:” it teaches to “use this world without abusing it,” yet is St. Paul’s example higher, who lived “crucified with his Saviour to the world and the world to him:” it sheds a grace and beauty around life’s innocent enjoyments, and teaches us a Christian mirthfulness, yet it points, as the higher and nobler, to “take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in *necessities*, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ’s sake <sup>1</sup>,”

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. xii. 10.

in St. Paul's eight-fold "perils;" "in weariness and "painfulness, in hunger and thirst, in cold and nakedness<sup>1</sup>;" it invests with a sacred awe "magistrates and "those who are in authority," yet bids those "who "would be chief among" us, "to be as the servants "of all;" it sanctifies marriage, but it places above it those who forego wives for His sake.

But what has this, my Lord, in common with Rome and Romanism? The preference of celibacy, as the higher state, is Scriptural, and as being such, is Primitive. The corruption of Rome was not its *preference*, but its tyrannical and ensnaring and avaricious, *enforcement*; it was in forcing (in the middle ages) the Clergy to separate from their wives, and, against the law of God, "putting those asunder, whom God had joined;" and this for her own aggrandizement, to make the Clergy more dependent upon herself; it was in conniving with the pride of parents, and entangling the reluctant daughters of the great with vows of celibacy, in order to obtain their dowry for her convents; it is in enforcing a rigid rule of singleness upon all her clergy, and drawing them into it before they know their own strength or weakness; it is in preferring the risk of their salvation to the risk of her own power, and casting them ruthlessly into temptation, without regard to the weak, rather than abandon a rule, which binds them all, though with an iron band, to herself. And thus that corrupt Church

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. xi. 26, 27.

has, in the minds of the undistinguishing, cast a reproach over that which Scripture points out as the more excellent, and tainted it with her pride, and avarice, and lust of power.

But why should men thus in their haste leap over to the contrary side, and exercise a tyranny over men's consciences in the opposite way? Why thus decry and revile as Popish what is Primitive? Why should not celibacy be used by those to whom it is given, to bind men's affections the more firmly to their LORD, instead of to Rome? Scripture says<sup>1</sup>, "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong unto the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things of the world, how he may please his wife." Why then cut off the aspirings of those more ardent minds, who hope thus to wait upon their LORD without distraction? Why not be thankful for our own blessings, without grudging to those who have foregone them for their LORD's sake, the blessing annexed to self-denial, that they might "give themselves," the rather, "wholly to these things," and to the service of their Lord? Why not content ourselves to be among those who have

"Love's supporting force  
To cheat the toil and cheer the way;"

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33.

without envying others

“ in their lonely course,  
(Lonely not forlorn <sup>1</sup>.)”—

Why, as Rome has tried, and in vain, to stretch out the limbs of her clergy to one uniform standard, should people among us use the other half of the ancient tyrant's cruelty, and setting up a lower standard, amputate all, which exceeds it? This forced mediocrity of attainment is unsafe as it is cruel; it provides no vent for those, who can find no rest in the ordinary and even paths of life; it drives such into Romanism, or makes them founders of fresh schisms among ourselves. A more generous course, which would have interposed, when necessary, the guidance of authority, and led but not inhibited, might have made Wesley and Whitfield useful members of the Church, instead of leaving them to plunge thousands into schism, and to train off into a delusive doctrine many of the best members of our Church. I am not advocating celibacy, my Lord, as the general rule of the Church, nor imposing upon others “a yoke, which I touch not with one of my fingers:” nor have any of us so done. But surely there is room for all; and while the peaceful duties of the country-pastor, can often be even better discharged, perhaps, by a married priest, “ruling <sup>2</sup> well his own house,

<sup>1</sup> Christian Year, Feast of St. John the Evangelist.

<sup>2</sup> Marriage Service.



and having his children in subjection in all gravity <sup>1</sup>," a pattern of domestic charities, there are surely duties enough in the Church, where celibacy may have its proper place, and where there is much room for the exhibition of the sterner grace of self-denial, foregoing all the highest earthly joys, which cheer us on our pilgrimage, passing alone and isolated through the world, and *visibly* living only for his Master's work, and to gather in his Master's scattered sheep. If the degraded population of many of our great towns are to be recovered from the state of Heathenism in which they are sunk, it must be by such preaching of the cross, wherein it shall be forced upon man's dull senses, that they who preach it have forsaken all, to take it up, and bear it after their LORD. They must, like St. Paul, "bear about in their bodies the marks of the Lord Jesus," the prints of His nails, and the piercing of His side. The preacher of repentance did not go forth "in soft clothing," or "living delicately," or encompassed with the joys of life; and if we, as we much need, are to have men "in the spirit and power of Elias, before the great and terrible day of the Lord," the very circumstances of their lives must correspond with, and declare the earnestness of their message, and that they have left all to bear it. There is need and room for soldiers of all sorts in the Lord's "willing army;" why cut off any one kind? why require that

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 4

all His warriors should “cumber themselves with the concerns of this life?” why should not some undertake a harder, so that it be, which in the Church of Rome it is not, a “willing service?” Why again should the daughters of our land be in a manner forced into marriage, as in the former days of Romanism they were into celibacy, and the days of the Old Testament be brought back upon us, and our maidens marry, in order to “take away their reproach among men,” now that He who was looked for is come, and they can serve Him, not by becoming mothers of the holy line whereof He was born, but by ministering to His members in a sanctified Virgin-estate? Why should we not also, instead of our desultory visiting-Societies, have our *Sœurs de la Charité*, whose spotless and religious purity might be their passport amid the scenes of misery and loathsomeness, carrying that awe about them, which even sin feels towards undefiledness, and impressing a healthful sense of shame upon guilt by their very presence? Why should marriage alone have its duties among the daughters of our great, and the single estate be condemned to an unwilling listlessness, or, left to seek undirected, and unauthorized, and unsanctified, ways of usefulness of its own?

Here, also, again, our Church, my Lord, preserves her equable moderation, not enforcing celibacy with the Romanist, nor despising it, with the world, nor dishonouring it, with the Ultra-Protestant, as having no

acceptableness nor excellency, but holding it forth as the result of a “gift” of God, to be observed and retained by those upon whom He has bestowed it, as being His gift, but not, of necessity, to be imposed upon or required of any. Only in this, as in other actions of life, she would not have us act, as altogether our own masters, but as having to give account of the gifts which we have received; she does not recommend her Clergy to marry, but only holds it “*lawful*” for them “as for all other Christian men;” nor regards it as a matter of course, (as is the case nowadays) but as a matter of earnest consideration; to be done or abstained from, “at their own discretion, *as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness* <sup>1</sup>.”

Such, my Lord, are all the topics, which an anxious, though not, I must think, an enlightened, jealousy for the purity of our Church has collected together, whereon to found its warning against what it, from its point of view, must consider as an approximation to Romanism. There has indeed been not a little carelessness in these charges even among those who appear to have taken most pains <sup>2</sup>, partly from a natural inability to understand a system, which was new to them, partly from an impatience not unnatural, at being disturbed in the quiet possession of one, which had become extensively popular, which they had accustomed themselves to consider as a

<sup>1</sup> Art. xxxii.

<sup>2</sup> Essays on the Church.

proof of the greater spirituality and enlightenment of the present age, and to contrast with the darkness of early times. They had, too, been wont to declaim in a popular way against Popery, without giving themselves much pains to understand its true character, or whether their own ground were tenable against it; their disappointment at the abandonment of any such positions is much the same as was felt by the Romanists at Courayer's defence of our orders; it takes out of their hands a convenient weapon, and they feel that they must look out for another, or at least their grasp of this seems less secure than before. Then, also, they do not understand the relation which our Church really holds to that of Rome; there seems to lurk at the bottom some suspicion that we set up a new Church at the Reformation, instead of merely purifying our ancient one; that we separated ourselves from Rome, instead of simply denying the undue authority of her bishop over us; that we "went out from" her, and are responsible for so doing, that we must have reasons, to show why we do not return to her. Not holding the doctrine of the Apostolical succession, they do not realize to themselves our position as an independent Church, that even independently of the question of our relative purity, we have no more occasion to go over to them than they to us; that individuals among us are bound to remain in the Church, through whose ministry they have been made members of CHRIST. They have not been accustomed to apply the argument to dissent, much



less can they to Romanism, which comes with so much more of system ; nay, they have in many cases disabled themselves from so doing by acting on a contrary principle towards other Churches; they have not been taught that affectionateness to their own Mother, which should instinctively hold them by her side ; they have not learned to regard their Bishops as the representatives of the Apostles, and to cleave to them as the centres of unity ; and so they must needs have some strong, hard arguments to satisfy themselves. Any diminution of these unsettles them, as having built on no solid foundation, except a general and sometimes exaggerated notion of the corruptions which Rome has actually and formally sanctioned. Hence one who cannot see that Rome is *the* Antichrist, seems to them to betray them into its hands.

And not only so, but even the very selection of certain topics for our controversy with Rome, has been thought to involve the abandonment of the rest. It so happened that the same writer, in two distinct places recommended to take practical grounds, leaving abstract arguments, or subjects which (as Transubstantiation) cannot be discussed without pain. Two independent opponents fell in, the one with the one essay in which seven such subjects were named, the other, writing against the Tracts, had not read this Tract, though expressly “on the controversy with Rome ;” but another in which four only were selected for illustration ; both, however, came to the same conclusion, that because only four or seven

happened to be put forward, therefore on all other points we hold with Rome. The argument certainly proves too much, unless seven and four are the same ; and it is somewhat characteristic of this hasty proceeding, that one of the Tracts<sup>1</sup> of the first year took up the same *fourteen* points, upon which Bishop Hall insists in " The Old Religion," as "*some* of our "*irreconcilable* differences with Rome as she is," and having so done, adds, " I might add other points in " which also I protest against the Church of Rome, " but I think it enough to make my confession in " Hall's order, and so leave it."

On the same ground, any concession that Rome is a true Church, is to them equivalent to saying that we should return under her shadow, forgetting what Bishop Hall states as the common sentiment of Divines, though in his days also it brought much declamation against him from Ultra-Protestants. " That which Rome holds with us, makes it a Church : " That which it obtrudes upon us, makes it heretical ; " The truth of principles makes it one, the error and " impiety of additions makes it irreconcilable, &c. " Look on the face therefore of the Roman Church, " she is ours, she is God's. Look on her back, she " is quite contrary, Antichristian : More plainly, " Rome doth both hold the foundation, and destroy " it ; she holds it directly, destroys it by consequent ; " In that she holds it she is a true Church, howsoever

<sup>1</sup> No. 38. p. 11. The passage is given in the Appendix, No. 14.

“impured; In that she destroys it, (what semblance “soever she makes) she is a Church of malignants. “If she did not altogether hold it, she should be “either no Church, or devilish, but now that she “professes to hold those things directly which by “inferences she closely overthrows, she is a truly “visible Church, but an unsound one<sup>1</sup>.”

When the time of trial shall come, it will be seen which principles most favour Rome, the Catholic or the Ultra-Protestant<sup>2</sup>. We have seen those in our own Church, who having held extreme Ultra-Protestant notions, have become converts to Rome, of whom she has much boasted. “Excuse me,” says Archbishop Bramhall<sup>3</sup>, “for telling the truth plainly; many “who have had their education among Sectaries and “Non-conformists have apostated to Rome, but few “or no right Episcopal Divines. *Hot water freezeth “the soonest.*” “Unthinking people,” says Bishop Sanderson<sup>4</sup>, . . . . “are carried away with mere noise and “pretences, and hope these will secure them against “the fears of Popery, who talk with most passion,

<sup>1</sup> Advertisement prefixed to the Reconciler : An Epistle pacificatory of the seeming differences of opinion concerning the true-ness and visibility of the Roman Church.

<sup>2</sup> In Scotland no member of the Church has fallen off to Romanism or any of the heresies which have distracted it; in Edinburgh alone, the Romanists boast of 100 converts from Presbyterianism yearly.

<sup>3</sup> Vindication of Grotius, Disc. 3, quoted Catena. Tracts, lxxiv. p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Unreasonableness of Separation, Pref. quoted ib. p. 25.

“ and with least understanding against it ; whereas  
 “ no persons do really give them greater advantages  
 “ than these do. For, where they meet only with  
 “ intemperate railings, and gross misunderstandings  
 “ of the state of the controversies between them and  
 “ us (which commonly go together), the most subtle  
 “ priests let such alone to spend their rage and fury ;  
 “ and when the heat is over, they will calmly en-  
 “ deavour to let them see how grossly they have  
 “ been deceived in some things, and so will more  
 “ easily make them believe, they are as much de-  
 “ ceived in all the rest. And thus the East and  
 “ West may meet at last, and the most furious  
 “ antagonists may become some of the easiest con-  
 “ verts. This I do really fear will be the case of  
 “ many thousands among us, who now pass for most  
 “ zealous Protestants ; if ever, which God forbid, that  
 “ religion should come to be uppermost in England.  
 “ It is, therefore, of mighty consequence for prevent-  
 “ ing the return of Popery, that men rightly under-  
 “ stand what it is. For, when they are as much  
 “ afraid of an innocent ceremony as of real idolatry,  
 “ and think they can worship images and adore the  
 “ Host on the same grounds that they may use the  
 “ sign of the Cross, or kneel at the Communion,  
 “ when they are brought to see their mistake in one  
 “ case, they will suspect themselves deceived in the  
 “ other also. . . . *When they find undoubted practices*  
 “ *of the Ancient Church condemned as Popish and*  
 “ *Antichristian by their teachers, they must conclude*



*“ Popery to be of much greater antiquity than really it is ; and when they can trace it so very near the Apostles’ times, they will soon believe it settled by the Apostles themselves. For it will be very hard to persuade any considering men, that the Christian Church should degenerate so soon, so unanimously, so universally, as it must do, if Episcopal government, and the use of some significant ceremonies, were any parts of that apostacy.”*

I have now, I trust, said enough, my Lord, to allay in some degree the strange alarms, which seem to have almost scared people “from their propriety.” In this alarm it is not strange that their fears should have been increased by the compliments bestowed by Romanists upon what we have put forth as the Anglican system. In some Romanists, this may have been sincere, for if they can find Romanism in Antiquity, as easily of course may they find it in the Anglican system, which wishes to be a faithful representative of Antiquity ; or if Ultra-Protestants think what we are persuaded is the system of our Church an approximation to Romanism, so may the Romanists, as contrasted with Ultra-Protestantism ; and those who accuse us of a Romanist tendency, are, of course, animating them to more vigorous efforts against our Church by holding out these delusive prospects of co-operation within her own camp. These may be sincere, for not many years past, when on the establishment of the new university at Bonn, a place of worship was set apart for the Lutherans, some Romanists

expressed to an eminent Lutheran theologian, their joy, that they were returning to the bosom of the true Church. The ground of this hope was that they had regular, though not daily, service, which they had not before. The Romanist regards all Church-order as belonging to him, disorder to those not in communion with his Church ; and so, any increase of order seems to him a return to *his* Church ; as, in truth, a Church which has daily service, and weekly Communion, has something in common with *his* Church, which a body that neglects these has not ; but only so far in common, as she agrees with Antiquity ; for our Church, if she realize her weekly communions, has a privilege which, in that of Rome, the laity have not, nor a daily service in a language which they understand.

But though some, especially the Romanist Laity, may be really misled, charity cannot suppose that those who are versed in the controversy between their Church and our's, are sincere in their congratulations on this revival of Catholic truth, which had slept among us. They know too well who are their true foes ; they even, now and then<sup>1</sup>, let some signs of annoyance escape them, in the very midst of their assumed ease and joy, like the Spartan boy, whose entrails the stolen fox was gnawing ; they feel that their own game is being spoiled ; they had hoped to come upon us unprepared, or armed with Ultra-Pro-

<sup>1</sup> In the Dublin Review.

testant weapons, which had never been proved in any real conflict ; and they are mortified at seeing us donning the ancient armour, which has stood proof against them in many a conflict, and which they have never been able to pierce. They had hoped, by aid of what is really ancient in their system, to bring back among us their own modern corruptions ; by aid of what is Catholic to introduce what is peculiar to Rome : they are annoyed at finding the posts pre-occupied, that members of our Church are conscious of her position, that she possesses stored up for her children every thing which they could hold out as an inducement to them to fall away to Rome. And so they have resorted to the corrupt policy which they practised of old against our Church, and would make men suspicious of the truth, as independent of their corruptions, knowing that if the truth be removed, men must fall sooner or later to their errors. If they can but bring our people out of the straight path, they doubt not that they must fall into their nets ; if they but set them against the pure truth, they must receive it drugged with other ingredients. Rome has enough of truth to prevail every where, except against Catholic truth itself ; it has been gaining upon the bodies which have severed themselves from our Church ; it knows well what are weak defences and what are strong ; it would draw us out of our strong-holds, and taunt us to abandon them and make us suspicious of them, as if they belonged to her. “ It <sup>1</sup> is a matter of history,

<sup>1</sup> Crosthwaite, Sermons on the Christian Ministry and the

“ that some of the first and most active promoters of  
 “ Puritanism, and afterwards of Non-conformity, were  
 “ Roman Catholic priests, who received orders, or pre-  
 “ tended to receive orders in our Church, that in the  
 “ disguise of friends they might more effectually dis-  
 “ turb and smite it. These men did not dare to broach  
 “ the peculiar tenets of their Church, but they endea-  
 “ voured to disunite and decompose the fabric of our  
 “ unity by infusing doubts and scruples ; by decrying  
 “ the Ecclesiastical discipline of our Church as an in-  
 “ fringement of Christian liberty ; by objecting to our  
 “ Liturgy and Cathedral service as formal and popish ;  
 “ by making their hearers to join in more spiritual and  
 “ exciting devotions ; and thus they gradually paved  
 “ the way for actual separation and dissent, and for all  
 “ the calamities which fell upon our country, and from  
 “ which we have never yet recovered. There is also  
 “ positive proof, that for a very considerable period,  
 “ Jesuits were regularly educated on the continent,  
 “ and sent over to these countries to enter into the  
 “ ministry, not only of our Church, but of every sect  
 “ in the nation.”—Rome is unchanged ; only her task  
 has become easier, since she then had to set people  
 against what were the acknowledged tenets of the  
 Church, and to stir up men’s minds to disaffection  
 against their Church ; now our Church is divided

Establishment of Christianity, p. 124. In the Appendix, Note B.  
 p. 143 sqq. is much curious evidence carefully brought together  
 on the part which disguised Romanists took in preaching up  
 Puritanism and declaiming against the Church as Popish.



against herself, and a large portion of her sons and ministers have unlearned in some respects the teaching of their Church, and are ready to disown it. But the line taken by Rome is the same. As her emissaries then declaimed against the use of the cross, "the service of the Church," "the communion table placed altar-ways" as Popish, so now would she create a suspicion against those who vindicate the ancient meaning of that service, and who speak of the "altar" or the "cross," as if such belonged to her; and they who have much in their mouths the craftiness and subtlety of Rome, are simple enough to suppose that she would thus lay open her own movements, and set people on their guard against those who were preparing the way for her. No, my Lord! those who are really doing her work, she allows to work on in peace; and by aid of the daily press, labours to spread their opinions, and to identify them with the system of our Church; so shall she, she well knows, gain an easy victory! She can afford to have Rome evil spoken of, if but the true Anglican system be disparaged also. It is but the exchange of the fable, the wolf-cubs for the shepherd-dogs.

"It<sup>1</sup> was again replied, yourselves have preached so much against Rome and his holiness, that Rome and her Romanists will be little the better for that change; but it was answered, you shall have mass sufficient for 100,000 in a short space, and the go-

<sup>1</sup> Romanist Consultations, in letter of Archbishop Bramhall, ib. p. 156.

“vernors never the wiser.” Let Rome but undermine the credit of the English doctrines as papistical, and she would have no difficulty in erecting her own upon the ruins. For the mind yearns toward the truth, and cannot wander about for ever, not knowing where to rest the sole of its foot ; if she misses a “sure resting-place,” she will afterwards take up with whatever seems least likely to betray her footing ; if she miss of truth in its purest and most awful form, she will afterwards be too glad to embrace it, amid whatever corruptions she may find it.

But we feel confident that it will not be so among us ; the cloud of suspicion that now lowers about us will, with a little patience, disperse ; it is a good omen that we are attacked by the same who are joined in an unnatural union against our Church, Romanist and Dissenter and Latitudinarian ; and if to these are, for the present, added many well-meaning members of our own Church, yet this has its origin in some natural misconception only, and will subside of itself, when they see our meaning more fully. Their prejudice lies not against the truths which we hold, but against certain consequences thought to be derived from them, or a negative way, in which they were in the last century held by many ; or they see not how to reconcile them with other truths which are indisputable, or with tenets which they have been taught to think so ; or they fear their effects on holiness of life ; or they know not how to distinguish them from Romish cor-

ruptions of them ; or they may be deterred by what of human infirmity may have cleaved to our statements. These and the like take time to remove.

But their fears will subside, and that the sooner, I doubt not, for the very extravagance of this temporary panic; and they who have been the most alarmed at the picture which periodicals have drawn of the principles put forward by us in the name of our Church, will embrace them the most fully when they learn their real character. They fear not our principles or practices, but principles or practices which we also should fear as well as they, and which have been given out for our's; they dread not the effects of our principles, but effects, which they have been led to associate with them, and which we should deprecate as truly; and when they see that veneration for Antiquity can be combined with thankfulness for the purity of our own Church<sup>1</sup>; that our views on Justification lead men of themselves to cast them on their Redeemer, justifying them freely, and keeping them justified by His Spirit, forgiving them freely, and crowning freely His own gifts in them; that our statements of sin after Baptism lead them the rather to His fulness of mercy, and amid acts of self-abasement, or self-chastening, or charity, to look not to these acts but to Him, to seek for their peace at His hand, whether directly or through the Ordinances of the Church, not from themselves, or from their works;

<sup>1</sup> See Index to Appendix, v. Anglo-Catholics, and Tract, No. 86.

that our views on the Sacraments tend to humble the Priest<sup>1</sup>, while they exalt the Priestly Office, and teach men not to rest on any *opus operatum*, but to guard and keep themselves the more diligently, because GOD has deigned so to sanctify them ; that the doctrine of the Apostolical succession tends to order and submissiveness within, and promotes charity and compassion for those without;—they will, we doubt not, examine the teaching of their Church more dispassionately than hitherto, and find it, in the main outline, to be what we have declared it.

Already an earnest of this has been given ; and

<sup>1</sup> The confessions of the Priests in the Ancient Liturgies, previous to the celebration of Divine Offices, imply very deep humiliation. It is only the corruptions of the Church of Rome, which tend to infuse spiritual pride into the priesthood ; the true doctrine humbles him. The following is the beginning of a confession in the Euchologion, to be said by the Priest for himself in the Baptismal service. (Assem. Cod. Lit. t. ii. p. 133, 4.)

“ O compassionate and merciful God, who searchest the heart  
 “ and reins, and Alone knowest the secrets of men, there is no-  
 “ thing hidden from Thee, but all things are naked and open to  
 “ Thine eyes. Thou who knowest all of me, cast me not away, nor  
 “ turn Thy face from me, but overlook my offences at this hour,  
 “ Thou that overlookest the sins of men on repentance. Wash  
 “ away the filth of my body and the defilement of my soul, and  
 “ sanctify me wholly and entirely with Thy invisible power and  
 “ spiritual right hand, lest announcing freedom to others, and im-  
 “ parting it through the faith of Thy unspeakable love for men,  
 “ I myself should be a castaway, as the servant of sin. Nay, O  
 “ Lord, who only art Good and compassionate, let me not be  
 “ turned away ashamed, but send forth to me power from on high,  
 “ and strengthen me to this ministry.”



the almost electric rapidity with which these principles are confessedly passing from one breast to another, from one end of England to the other, the sympathy, which they find in the sister or daughter Churches of Scotland and America, might well make men suspect that there is more than human agency at work ; this indeed has been acknowledged ; and they who have not seen GOD's hand in it have attributed it to Satan<sup>1</sup> ; yet will they too in time, we trust, see its fruits to be good, and acknowledge that Satan is not "divided against himself;" and now also they attribute to him, we hope, not the actual workings, but rather those which they apprehend. A note has been struck (I may speak, my Lord, on this subject, as not speaking boastfully, since it was not I who thought of striking it,) which has vibrated through every part of the frame of our Church, attesting at once the unity of the body, which so responded, and that itself had been attuned to it by a higher unseen Hand. They who struck the note were but as the bow in the hand of Him, who blends into harmony men's discordant wills, and out of their varying affections brings forth one concordant whole. Others have essayed to do it before and as faithfully, and under circumstances which seemed more favourable, yet none answered ; "they piped, but none danced ; they mourned, but "none wept:" and now that some of the doctrines had seemed to be gradually expiring, and those who

<sup>1</sup> Essays, p. 278, seqq.

had handed them down amid a forgetful generation, were drawing toward the close of their labours, the closed ear has been unsealed, and the sleeping sympathy been awakened; showing in both cases Whose it is to “waken<sup>1</sup> the ear to hear as the learned;” perhaps, as the prelude of a time, when, more than hitherto, “the eyes<sup>2</sup> of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped.” For all things seem to be drawing one way. The simultaneous tendency towards a more Church-feeling among ourselves, among bodies separated from us, or again in Germany and Denmark feeling after it, (although in the absence of a Church-system which has been preserved to us, not knowing where to find it,) the increased energy of Romanism itself, (at least in France and America where it exists in its least corrupted form,) all point to some further coming of the Redeemer’s kingdom, when what is done shall be done in His Name, not in man’s; by His Church, and by individuals as members of it, not in themselves. The watch-word for our re-union is that, wherein God had made us one in Himself, His Church; not as an establishment, or as unestablished,—these are but accidents in her existence, and to be dealt with according to the Apostolic rule, “wherein any have been called, therein let him remain with God,” in England let us not seek to be unestablished, nor in the United States to be established—not as an instrument

<sup>2</sup> Is. l. 4.

<sup>1</sup> Ib. xxxv. 5.

of temporal or spiritual power, but as a well-ordered society, invested with spiritual gifts, and having a spiritual existence, and united with its Invisible Head, the channel of His graces to us, and wherein we are in Him, wherein “God hath set<sup>1</sup>, first, “Apostles” (and as their successors, the Bishops), “secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers,” “for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of CHRIST, till we all come, in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of GOD unto [one] perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ<sup>2</sup>.” Disunion has been the bane of the Church, ever since suspicion and separation fell upon the Eastern and Western Churches; attempts outwardly to cement what has been so severed have ever failed: so an inanimate body may be cemented, not a living and spiritual body: but now that men’s spirits in different countries seem to be drawn—not directly together or to compass unions of Churches by man’s arrangement or human wisdom, but to converge—towards One common Centre, wherein all shall find themselves united; when men severally mourn over the decay in which the City of GOD lies, and “pity<sup>3</sup> the dust thereof,” then may we hope that “the heathen shall fear the Name of the Lord, and all the kings of the earth His glory,” then “the Lord shall build up Zion, He shall appear in His glory;” and

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 28.<sup>2</sup> Eph. ii. 12.<sup>3</sup> Ps. cii. 13—16.

our “night of heaviness” shall be past, and “joy come” in the “dawning of the morning” which the Christian Church has so long “watched for.” When we feel the miseries of our disunion, and humble ourselves for our share of it, then may we hope that He “will bind up the breaches,” and the “One shepherd” will restore the fences of our “one fold,” when we have learnt to long for it.

To you, my Lord, in whatever degree we might hope that we were in this our portion of the Vineyard but the lowest and meanest labourers towards this glorious restoration, we owe much real thanks, as well for the fatherly encouragement which you have given us, as for the warning which you have conveyed to those especially, who have learned of us. It has been a singular mercy of God to us hitherto, that no extravagance has connected itself with the doctrines to which we have claimed attention. Such had perhaps never been the case at any former restoration of forgotten doctrine. It is a familiar argument in such cases, that “the abuse is no argument against the use,” and the very frequency of the maxim shows how closely the abuse attends upon the use. When a system now very popular was commenced, it had often to apologize for the extravagancies of those to whom it was a passage to dissent; and even of late years, it has not been unfrequent that even Ministers of this class have fallen off into schism: to us, they have been able at present to object only what they deem a *tendency* towards Ro-



manism, but have not shown any case in which that tendency has been followed out. And this, as we thankfully acknowledge it to have been a great mercy of God, so has He doubtless in part thereby brought it about, that these doctrines have in the first instance mainly taken root in the University, which nurtured ourselves. For the solid and real and self-denying training and discipline which has made this University what it is, has prepared the minds of those committed to her, to receive simply and solidly and practically, the Catholic system, when they became acquainted with it. Catholic truth is indeed so intrinsically practical, that it is less exposed than any human system, however apparently spiritual, to be received as a mere theory. Even where it has been embraced without any consciousness of sacrifices involved, it has in well-prepared minds gradually drawn toward the shore those whom it had inclosed in its net ; they contentedly found their liberty circumscribed ; the submission to rightful authority characteristic of the true Catholic system repressed too individual tendencies ; it wound itself around them ; encircled them with its solemn rounds of duties and devotions and abstinences ; thwarting the natural will, and subduing self, calming the passions and elevating the affections ; not acting turbidly, but rather unloosing limb by limb from their enthrallments, and gently moulding and fashioning them to perform the fuller measures of the duties of the Gospel. It is of the very nature of Catholic truth to merge self, and with

it the extravagancies of self, in the sense of being a member of CHRIST in the Communion of His glorious Saints; to suppress thoughts, as if any were doing great things, by the sense of doing them under authority and guidance. One has begun probably by one portion of the system, another by another, as Providence guided his disposition or his circumstances; yet as he took up, one by one, increasing duties, he found himself but filling up voids in himself; his unevenness or inequalities softened; inconsistencies subdued, and himself by each such approximation, only rendered less out of harmony with the system in which he was placed; not thinking himself "some great one," but rather "an unprofitable servant," who was slowly learning to "do that which it was his duty to do."

But although such, by the mercy of GOD, has been the course of things hitherto, and one may appeal with confidence to the general character of our younger members, who whether consciously or unconsciously have been absorbed into the system, that this change has, as a whole, manifested itself in a subdued and chastened spirit, we cannot expect that if the purifying obloquy, under which we now lie, should be withdrawn, there will not be found those who will embrace that system intellectually only, or take the shadow for the substance, and so bring evil repute upon it. Satan has ever sown tares among the wheat; and the parable seems by its frequent fulfilment to have the nature of a prophecy, that it should ever be so. If the

Church be that great instrument of blessing, which Scripture implies, and which we in our Creeds profess, one must expect that Satan will in varying ways endeavour to seduce men from realizing it, and to continue their depreciation of it. It were too bold to hope that the truths now anew recognized, will not be overcast by some clouds, which the god of this world may be permitted to interpose. Enough, if their general influence be to warm and kindle. Even of Divine Grace it has been said, that "like the sun, whom it does not soften, it hardens;" much more then of any form of Divine Truth.

It were then nothing, whereat to be dismayed, were Satan allowed in some cases, to pervert these doctrines, and mislead into Popery some who had partially embraced them. There was a Simon Magus among the first baptized Christians; the Anabaptists and the Socinians were a produce of the reformation. We are conscious also, that the press is but a rude way of disseminating truth; it conveys it on the whole, but unadapted to particular cases; and so it often happens, as in the case of human medicines, that persons will misapply them, those who need them will neglect them, others use them wrongly, or employ them, while continuing in habits of life, which neutralize them, or make them pernicious. In a sounder state of the Church, where all the members of our flocks would have spiritual advisers, and the advisers themselves be more carefully trained, this evil

would be much mitigated ; meanwhile, the system will bear the blame of what it would provide against, would men but adopt it completely.

This is said only for fear “ offences should come,” and some be scandalized at them ; for the present, the influence of these truths has been rather exercised in the contrary and their rightful direction ; furnishing a resting-place from Romanism to some who were wandering thither, and recovering others from it to the bosom of our English branch of the Church : meanwhile we commit cheerfully our way unto Him who has thus far prospered His truth ; trusting, not in the Church-system, but in Him who ordered it ; not in the force of truth only, but in Him Who is the Truth ; not in the Church, but in Him Who is “ its Saviour,” and “ Who gave Himself for “ it, that He might cleanse it by the washing of “ water in the word, and present it to Himself a “ glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any “ such thing, but that it might be holy and without “ blemish.” That your Lordship’s endeavours for the good of that portion of the Church committed unto you, may be prospered, is our daily prayer : to obey your godly admonitions, and to follow your guidance, is our earnest desire. May He, who has called you to this high office, make it hereafter your crown and joy, and requite you, as well for your labours and anxieties, as for your kindness to those who labour under you in the Vineyard.



With true respect for your sacred character, and  
(if it be not too bold) affectionate acknowledgment of  
your Lordship's unvarying kindness,

I have the honour to remain,

Your Lordship's faithful Servant,

E. B. PUSEY.

CHRIST CHURCH,  
*Feast of St. Matthias, 1839.*

# PRINCIPAL SUBJECTS OF THE ABOVE LETTER.

	PAGE
Art. VI. and XX.—On the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation ; <i>and</i> Of the authority of the Church .....	26
Art. XI.—Of the justification of Man.....	62
Art. XVI.—Of sin after Baptism .....	81
Art. XXV.—On the Sacraments.....	97
Baptism .....	109
Art. XXVIII.—Of the Lord's Supper .....	125
Art. XXIII.—Of ministering in the Congregation.....	146
Prayers for those departed in the faith and fear of God ....	186
Invocation of Saints.....	192
Celibacy .....	208

A P P E N D I X.

---

EXTRACTS

FROM THE

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES,

THE

LYRA APOSTOLICA,

AND

OTHER PUBLICATIONS;

SHOWING THAT

TO OPPOSE ULTRA-PROTESTANTISM

IS NOT

TO FAVOUR POPERY.





## EXTRACTS,

&c.

---

### EXTRACTS FROM THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

1. "IT is certain that the Bishops and Clergy in England and Ireland remained the same as before the separation; and that it was these, with the aid of the civil power, who delivered the Church of those kingdoms from the yoke of Papal tyranny and usurpation; while at the same time they gradually removed from the minds of the people various superstitious opinions and practices which had grown up during the middle ages."—No. 15. p. 4.

2. "That there is not a word in Scripture about our duty to obey the Pope, is quite clear. The Papists, indeed, say that he is the successor of St. Peter; and that, therefore, he is head of all Bishops, because St. Peter bore rule over the other Apostles. But though the Bishops of Rome were often called the successors of St. Peter in the early Church, yet every other Bishop had the same title. And though it be true that St. Peter was the *foremost* of the Apostles, that does not prove that he had any dominion over them. . . . And so Rome has ever had what is called the *primacy* of the Christian Churches, but it has not, therefore, any right to interfere in their internal administration."—*Ibid.* p. 5.

3. "But it may be said, that we have really no valid orders, as having received them from an heretical Church. True, Rome may be so considered now; but she was not heretical in the primitive ages."—*Ibid.* p. 10.

4. "It may be said, that we threw blame on Luther, and others of the foreign Reformers, who *did* act without the authority of their Bishops. But we reply, that it has been always agreeable to the principles of the Church, that, if a Bishop taught and upheld what was contrary to the orthodox faith, the Clergy and people were not bound to submit, but were obliged to maintain the true religion."—*Ibid.* p. 11.

5. "While they [the writer and others] consider that the revival of this portion of truth is especially adapted to break up existing parties in the Church, and to form instead a bond of union among all who love the LORD JESUS CHRIST in sincerity; they believe that nothing but these neglected doctrines, faithfully preached, will repress that extension of Popery, for which the ever-multiplying divisions of the religious world are too clearly preparing the way."—*Advertisement to Vol. i.* p. 5.

6. "You have some misgivings, it seems, lest the doctrine I have been advocating 'should lead to Popery.' I will not, by way of answer, say, that the question is not whether it will *lead to Popery*, but whether it is *in the Bible*; because it would bring the Bible and Popery into one sentence, and seem to imply the possibility of a 'communion' between 'light and darkness.' No; it is the very enmity I feel against the Papistical corruptions of the Gospel, which leads me to press upon you a doctrine of Scripture, which we are sinfully surrendering, and the Church of Rome has faithfully retained.

"How comes it that a system so unscriptural as the Popish makes converts? Because it has in it an element of truth and comfort amid its falsehoods. And the true way of opposing it is not to give up to them that element, which God's providence has preserved to us also, thus basely surrendering 'the inheritance of our fathers,' but to claim it as our own."—*No. 20. p. 1.*

7. "Truly when one surveys the grandeur of their system, a sigh arises in the thoughtful mind, to think that we should be separate from them; Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!—But, alas! AN UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE<sup>1</sup>. Their communion is infected with heterodoxy; we are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth; and by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed; it cannot be reformed."—*Ibid. p. 3.*

8. "He has wonderfully preserved our Church as a true branch of the Church Universal, yet withal preserved it free from doctrinal heresy. It is Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Papistical. . . . Depend upon it, to insist on the doctrine of the visible Church is not to favour the Papists, it is to do them the most serious injury. It is to deprive them of their only strength."—*Ibid. p. 4.*

9. "— Though it may please God that we should suffer for a while—as we suffered, together with good King Charles, at the hands of the dissenters; as we suffered in the days of bloody Queen Mary, at the hands of the Roman Catholics; as we suffered during the first three hundred years after CHRIST, at the hands of the Heathens and the Jews, yet—eventually, triumph will await us."—*No. 23. p. 3.*

10. "As to the *manner* of the presence of the body and blood of our LORD in the Blessed Sacrament, we that are Protestant and Reformed, according to the ancient Catholic Church, do not search into the manner of it with perplexing inquiries. . . . Had the Romish maintainers of Transubstantiation done the same, they would not have determined and decreed, and then imposed as an article of faith absolutely necessary to salvation, a manner of presence, newly by them invented, under pain of the most direful curse; and there would have been in the Church less wrangling, and more peace and

<sup>1</sup> Vid. infr. Extract 50.

unity than now is.”—*No. 27. p. 2.—Bishop Cosin on Transubstantiation.*

11. “It is in vain that they bring Scripture to defend this their stupendous doctrine [transubstantiation]; and it is not true, what they so often and so confidently affirm, that the Universal Church hath always constantly owned it, being it was not so much as heard of in the Church for many ages, and hath been but lately approved by the Pope’s authority in the Councils of Lateran and Trent.”—*Ibid. p. 16.*

12. “The history of the Papists is this. Many centuries ago, strange and corrupt notions and practices prevailed in many of the Churches in Europe. Among others, people thought the Pope or Bishop of Rome was gifted with authority from Heaven to control all the branches of the Church on earth, and that his word was to be of more weight than even the Holy Scriptures themselves. But about three hundred years ago, the Bishops of the Church of England saw these errors in their true light.”—*No. 30. p. 5.*

13. “*Clericus.* Say more definitely what the charge against me is. *Laicus.* That your religious system, which I have heard some persons style the Apostolical, and which I so name by way of designation, is like that against which our forefathers protested at the Reformation.

*C.* I will admit it, *i. e.*, if I may reverse your statement, and say that the Popish system resembles it. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, seeing that all corruptions of the truth must be like the truth which they corrupt, else they would not persuade mankind to take them instead of it?”—*No. 38. p. 1.*

14. “Be assured of this,—no party will be more opposed to our doctrine, if it ever prospers and makes noise, than the Roman party. This has been proved before now. In the seventeenth century, the theology of the divines of the English Church was substantially the same as ours is; and it experienced the full hostility of the Papacy. It was the true *Via Media*: Rome sought to block up that way, as fiercely as the Puritans. History tells us this. In a few words, then, before we separate, I will state some of my irreconcilable differences with Rome as she is; and in stating her errors, I will closely follow the order observed by Bishop Hall in his treatise on *The Old Religion*, whose Protestantism is unquestionable.

I consider that it is unscriptural to say with the Church of Rome, that ‘we are justified by inherent righteousness.’

That it is unscriptural that ‘the good works of a man justified do *truly* merit eternal life.’

That the doctrine of transubstantiation, as not being revealed, but a theory of man’s devising, is profane and impious.

That the denial of the cup to the laity, is a bold and unwarranted encroachment on their privileges as CHRIST’S people.

That the sacrifice of masses, as it has been practised in the Roman



Church, is without foundation in Scripture or antiquity, and therefore blasphemous and dangerous.

That the honour paid to images is very full of peril, in the case of the uneducated, that is, of the great part of Christians.

That indulgences, as in use, are a gross and monstrous invention of later times.

That the received doctrine of purgatory is at variance with Scripture, cruel to the better sort of Christians, and administering deceitful comfort to the irreligious.

That the practice of celebrating divine service in an unknown tongue is a great corruption.

That forced confession is an unauthorized and dangerous practice.

That the direct invocation of saints is a dangerous practice, as tending to give, often actually giving, to creatures the honour and reliance due to the Creator alone.

That there are not seven sacraments.

That the Roman doctrine of Tradition is unscriptural.

That the claim of the Pope to be universal bishop is against Scripture and antiquity.

I might add other points in which also I protest against the Church of Rome, but I think it enough to make my confession in Hall's order, and so leave it."—*Ibid.* p. 11.

15. "Rome has to confess her Papal corruptions, and her cruelty towards those who refuse to accept them."—*No.* 8. p. 4.

16. "The Church has in a measure forgotten its own principles, as declared in the sixteenth century; nay, under stranger circumstances, as far as I know, than have attended any of the errors and corruptions of the Papists. Grievous as are their declensions from primitive usage, I never heard in any case of their practice directly contradicting their services; whereas we go on lamenting once a year the absence of discipline in our Church, yet do not even dream of taking any one step towards its restoration."—*No.* 41. p. 1.

17. "Do you not suppose that there are multitudes both among clergy and laity at the present day, who disparage not indeed CHRIST's merits, but the sacraments He has appointed? and if so, is not their error so far the same in kind as that of the Romish church—the preferring Abana and Pharpar to the waters of Jordan? . . . Happily we are not as yet so corrupted as at the era of the Reformation; . . . yet is not the mode of viewing the subject I refer to, a growing one, and how does it differ from the presumption of the Papists? In both cases the power of CHRIST's sacraments is denied; in the one case by the unbelief of restlessness and fear, in the other by the unbelief of profaneness."—*Ibid.* p. 2.

18. "Our Reformers in the sixteenth century did not touch the existing documents of doctrine; there was no occasion; they kept the creeds as they were; but they *added* protests against the corruptions of faith, worship, and discipline, which had grown up round them."—*Ibid.* p. 3.



19. "While Dissenters are exclusive on the one hand, Papists are so on the other. The council of Trent converted certain theological opinions into (what they maintained to be) Catholic verities. This was wrong, whoever did it; but it is some comfort to find, that the body that thus became uncatholic, was not the Church Catholic itself."—*No. 61. p. 3.*

20. "This case [departure from antiquity] had been instanced even before Vincentius's time, in the history of the Arians. In our own day it is fulfilled in the case of the Church of Rome, which indeed has not erred *vitally*, as the Arians did, nor has infected with its errors the whole Church, yet has to answer for very serious corruptions, which it has not merely attempted, but managed to establish in a great part of the Churches of Christendom. Here then apply Vincentius's test—Antiquity; and the Church of Rome is convicted of unsoundness, as fully as those other sects among us which have already been submitted to the trial."—*Records of the Church, No. XXIV. p. 3.*

21. "How miserably contrasted are we with the One Holy Apostolic Church of old, which 'serving with one consent,' spoke 'a pure language!' And now that Rome has added, and we have omitted in the catalogue of sacred doctrines, what is left to us but to turn our eyes sorrowfully and reverently to those ancient times, and, with Bishop Ken, make it our profession to live and 'die in the faith of the Catholic Church before the division of the East and West?'" —*Ibid. No. XXV. p. 11.*

22. "The following are selected by way of specimen of those practical grievances to which Christians are subjected in the Roman communion:—1. The denial of the cup to the laity. 2. The necessity of the priest's intention to the validity of the sacraments. 3. The necessity of confession. 4. The unwarranted anathemas of the Roman Church. 5. Purgatory. 6. Invocation of saints. 7. Images." —*No. 71. p. 9, et seq.*

23. "We cannot consent to confine ourselves to a mere reference to the text of the Tridentine decrees, as Romanists would have us, apart from the teaching of their doctors, and the practice of the Church, which are surely the legitimate comment upon them. . . . The conduct of the Catholics during the troubles of Arianism affords us a parallel case. They interpreted the language of the Creeds by the professed opinions of their framers. They would not allow error to be introduced into the Church by an artifice. . . . Apply this to the case of Romanism. We are not indeed allowed to take at random the accidental doctrine or practice of this or that age, as an explanation of the decrees of the Latin Church; but when we see clearly that certain of these decrees have a natural tendency to produce certain evils, when we see those evils actually existing far and wide in that Church, in different nations and ages, existing especially where the system is allowed to act most freely—under such circumstances surely it is not unfair to consider our case parallel to that of the Catholics

during the ascendancy of Arianism—and to apprehend that, did we express our assent to the creed of Pope Pius, we should find ourselves bound hand and foot—to the corruptions of those who profess it.”—*Ibid.* p. 15, *et seq.*

24. “Should it be inquired whether this admission of incompleteness in our own system does not lead to projects of change and reform, on the part of individuals, it must be answered plainly in the negative. Such an admission has but reference to the question of *abstract* perfection; as a practical matter, it will be our wisdom as individuals to enjoy what God’s good providence has left us, lest, striving to obtain more, we lose what we still possess.”—*Ibid.* p. 35.

25. “One great unfairness practised by Roman controversialists has been to adduce in behalf of their own peculiarities, doctrines or customs of the primitive Church, which resembling them in appearance are really of a different character. Thus because the early Fathers spoke of the Holy Communion in such reverent and glowing terms, as became those who understood its real nature and virtue, they have tried to make it appear that they believed in their own theory of transubstantiation. Whereas they spoke of it as a *commemorative* sacrifice, they have thence taken occasion to make it a *real* and *proper* sacrifice. The doctrine of ecclesiastical penances they have converted into the theory of satisfactions to Almighty God for sins committed. The existence of *Apostolical tradition* in the early Church, in behalf of the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, and the like, has been made a pretence for introducing *so-called* Apostolical traditions concerning various unfounded opinions in faith and practice.”—*No.* 72. p. 1.

26. “Of course there is no reason why the Church might not, in the use of her discretion, limit as well as select the portions of the inspired volume which were to be introduced into her devotions; but there were serious reasons why she should not defraud her children of ‘their portion of meat in due season;’ and it would seem as if the eleventh, or at least the twelfth century, a time fertile in other false steps in religion, must be charged also, as far as concerns Rome and its more intimate dependencies, with the partial removal of the light of the written word from the sanctuary.”—*No.* 75. p. 7.

27. “Haymo’s edition, which was introduced into the Roman Church by Nicholas III. A.D. 1278, is memorable for another and still more serious fault. Graver and sounder matter being excluded, apocryphal legends of saints were used to stimulate and occupy the popular mind; and a way was made for the use of those invocations to the Virgin and other saints, which heretofore were unknown in public worship. The addresses to the Blessed Mary in the Breviary, as it is at present constituted, are such as the following: the Ave Mary, before commencing every office through the day, and at the end of compline; at the end of Lauds and Vespers, an Antiphon invocatory of the Virgin; the Officium B. Mariæ on the Sabbath or Saturday,

and sundry other offices, containing hymns and antiphons in her honour. These portions of the Breviary carry with them their own plain condemnation, in the judgment of an English Christian; no commendation of the general structure and matter of the Breviary itself will have any tendency to reconcile him to them, &c. . . . These usages [Invocations] certainly *now* do but sanction and encourage that direct worship of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, which is the great practical offence of the Latin Church.”—*Ibid.* p. 9.

28. “They [the Invocations] are here given in order to show clearly, as a simple inspection of them will suffice to do, the utter contrariety between the Roman system, as actually existing, and our own; which, however similar in certain respects, are in others so at variance, as to make any attempt to reconcile them together in their present state, perfectly nugatory. Till Rome moves towards us, it is quite impossible that we should move towards Rome; however closely we may approximate to her in particular doctrines, principles, or views.”—*Ibid.* p. 23.

29. “And further still, as regards the doctrine of purgatorial suffering, there have been for many ages in the Roman Church gross corruptions of its own doctrine, untenable as that doctrine is even by itself. The decree of the Council of Trent acknowledges the fact. Now we believe that those corruptions still continue; that Rome has never really set herself in earnest to eradicate them. The pictures of Purgatory so commonly seen in countries in communion with Rome, the existence of Purgatorian societies, the means of subsistence accruing to the clergy from belief in it, afford a strange contrast to the simple wording and apparent innocence of the decree by which it is made an article of faith. It is the contrast between poison in its lifeless seed, and the same developed, thriving, and rankly luxuriant in the actual plant.”—*No.* 79. p. 3.

30. [As to the tendency to substitute the Virgin as the object of religious worship.] “The great Catholic doctrine of the Trinity being so strongly established among them [the Romanists] by entering into all their devotional forms and creeds, that it could not be shaken; human depravity has sought out an opening for itself under another shape. It is by this means the natural heart lowers the object of its worship to its own frailty.”—*No.* 80. p. 80.

31. “The Romish Church corrupted and marred the Apostolic doctrine in two ways—first, by the error of Transubstantiation, secondly, by that of Purgatory; and in both there occurs that peculiar corruption of the administrators of the Romish Church, that they countenance so much more of profitable error than in their abstract system they acknowledge.”—*No.* 81. *On the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, p. 7.

32. “These false notions in themselves aggrandized the character of the priesthood: and as such, it was part of the unhappy policy



of Rome to countenance them ; and while (to take the mildest view) she narrowly observed the erroneous tendencies, which were almost unavoidably mixed up in the minds of individuals with the reformed doctrine, she had no sense for her own. She thought no deeds cruel, which would remove the moles that threatened to darken her sister's eye, but perceived not the beam in her own. While repressing, even by the shedding of blood, the slightest approximation to the reformed doctrine, she rebuked not errors which entrenched on the authority of our LORD."—*Ibid.* p. 8.

33. "The language of the Council (of Trent) on the Sacrifice is in itself capable of a good interpretation, were it not that terms employed in it must be explained with reference to that Church's acknowledged doctrines of Transubstantiation and Purgatory. AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRIFICE CANNOT BE THE SAME, WHERE TRANSUBSTANTIATION IS HELD, AND WHERE IT IS NOT."—*Ibid.* p. 47.

---

EXTRACTS FROM "LYRA APOSTOLICA."

34. "Once, as I brooded o'er my guilty state,  
 A fever seized me, duties to devise  
 To buy me interest in my Saviour's eyes ;  
 Not that His love I would extenuate,  
 But scourge and penance, and perverse self-hate,  
 Or gift of cost, served by an artifice  
 To quell my restless thoughts, &c. . . .  
 Thus as I tossed, He said : ' Even holiest deeds  
 Shroud not the soul from God, nor soothe its needs,' " &c.  
*Lyra Apostolica*, (Ed. 2.) 9.
35. "I will not say with these, that bread and wine  
 Have vanished at the consecration prayer," &c. *Ibid.* 33.
36. "Ah, Saviour, LORD ! with Thee my heart  
 Angel nor Saint shall share ;  
 To Thee 'tis known, for man Thou art,  
 To soothe each tumult there."—*Ibid.* 51.
37. "They are at rest :  
 We may not stir the heaven of their repose  
 By rude invoking voice, or prayer address  
 In waywardness to those,  
 Who in the mountain grotts of Eden lie," &c.—*Ibid.* 52.
38. "Mark how each Creed stands in that Test reveal'd,  
 Romish and Swiss and Lutheran novelties !  
 As in the light of Spenser's magic shield,  
 Falsehood lets fall her poisoned cup and flies,  
 Rome's seven-headed monster sees and dies !"—*Ibid.* 97.
39. "O LORD and CHRIST, Thy Churches of the South  
 So shudder, when they see



The two-edged sword sharp-issuing from Thy mouth.  
As to fall back from Thee,  
And seek to charms of man, or saints above,  
To aid them against Thee, Thou Fount of grace and love !

But I before Thine awful eyes will go,  
And firmly fix me there,  
In my full shame ;" &c.—*Ibid.* 105.

40. " The flood-gates on me open wide,  
And headlong rushes in the turbulent tide  
Of lusts and heresies ! a motley troop they come ;  
And old imperial Rome  
Looks up, and lifts again half-dead  
Her seven-horned head ;" &c.—*Ibid.* 111.

41. " How shall I name thee, Light of the wide West,  
Or heinous error-seat ?  
O Mother erst, close tracing Jesus' feet !  
Do not thy titles glow  
In those stern judgment fires, which shall complete  
Earth's strife with Heaven, and ope the eternal woe ?"  
*Ibid.* 170.

42. " O Mother Church of Rome ! why has thy heart  
Beat so untruly towards thy northern child ?  
Why give a gift, nor give it undefiled,  
Drugging thy blessing with a stepdame's art ? &c.  
. . . And now thou sendest foes  
Bred from thy womb, lost Church ! to mock the throes  
Of thy free child, thou cruel-natured Rome !" —*Ibid.* 171.

43. " O that thy creed were sound !  
For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome,  
By thy unwearied watch and varied round  
Of service, in thy Saviour's holy home." —*Ibid.* 172.

---

EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF DR. PUSEY.

44. " In different ways man would forestall the sentence of his judge ; the Romanist by the sacrament of penance ; a modern class of divines by the appropriation of the merits and righteousness of our blessed Redeemer ; the Methodists by sensible experience ; our own, with the ancient Church, preserves a reverent silence, not cutting off hope, and yet not nurturing an untimely confidence, or a presumptuous security." —*Pusey on Baptism*, p. xiv.

44. (b) " Lastly, I would beseech those, for whom these tracts are mainly intended, our younger labourers in the LORD'S vineyard, for their own sakes, as well as of those, of whose souls they must give account, neither here, nor in any other portion of these tracts, to be deterred by any vague fear of an approximation (as they may

be led to think) to any doctrines or practices of the corrupt Church of Rome ; not to allow themselves to fall in with any of those charges, which ignorant men are wont to make, of "the early corruptions of Christianity," and which are the bulwark of Socinianism, and of every other heresy. Since the Swiss reformers set aside primitive antiquity, and took a new model of their own, Antiquity if tried by the standard of Zuinglianism or Calvinism, must, of course, appear to approximate to the modern Church of Rome ; for that Church has retained, in a corrupted form, doctrines and rites, which the Swiss reformation rejected. Hence, the Lutheran (see p. 104), the Bohemian (p. 233), and our own Church, have, by the admirers of that reformation, ever been looked upon as Papistical ; as they, in their turn, have, by the "extreme reformation of the Socinians" (p. 198-9), been held, and rightly, to have stopped short of the results of their own principles, and have been represented, though wrongly, as retainers of Alexandrian "corruptions of Christianity." Hooker's defence of our Church is but one instance of this wide difference between ours and the Zuinglian reformation. Our Church (blessed be God,) never took Luther, or Calvin, or any modern name for its teacher or its model, but primitive antiquity : and by the Holy Scripture alone, and the universal consent of Primitive Antiquity, as the depository of its doctrines, and the witness of its teaching, would she be judged<sup>1</sup>. In these principles of our dear mother, the Church of England, have we been trained, and in these old ways we would humbly tread."—*Ibid.* p. xvii.

45. "We cannot sufficiently admire the lovingkindness of Almighty God, who allowed the seeds indeed of Reformation to be sown among us by Wickliffe; yet then, notwithstanding the powerful human aid which he had, and his great popularity, caused them to lie, as it were, in the earth, until those which were less sound should, by length of time, decay ; and again, that He placed so many impediments in the way of our final Reformation (for what man does rapidly he does rashly), and held back our steps by the arbitrariness of Henry ; and, when we were again going down the stream of the times too readily, checked us at once by the unexpected death of Edward, and proved us by the fire of the Marian persecution, and took away, by a martyr's death, those in whom we most trusted ; and then finally employed a number of labourers, in the restoration of His Temple, of whom none should yet be so conspicuous, that the edifice should seem to be his design, or that he should be tempted to restore the decayed parts according to any theory of his own, but rather that all things should be made "according to the pattern which He had shown us in the Church primitive. Had our reform taken place at first, we had been Wickliffites ; under Edward, we had been a branch of the Reformed

<sup>1</sup> There are some brief, but valuable notices of the peculiarity of the Church of England in the late Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions, and some striking quotations from ancient divines, domestic and foreign, who have remarked it, as an excellence ; so also in Bp. Bull's *Apologia pro Harmonia*, sect. 1. § 4. ed. Burton.

Zuinglian or the Calvinist Church : now we bear no human name ; we look to no human founder ; we have no one reformer to set up as an idol ; we are neither of Paul nor of Apollos ; nor have we any human maxims or theories as the basis of our system ; but we have been led back at once to the distant fountains, where the waters of life, fresh from their source, flowed most purely."—*Ibid.* pp. 105, 106.

46. "In this, as in many other cases, we must distinguish between the practical corruptions of the Church of Rome and her theoretical errors. For it often happens that she leads her members into error, and countenances corruption in them, when her statements in themselves are not very unsound ; teaching us how much evil what seems a little departure from the truth may create."—*Ibid.* p. 192.

47. "In justice then to ourselves, as well as to the Romanists, we must bear in mind that the unhappy and fatal canons of the Council of Trent were directed, in part, against actual error, such as had mixed itself with the then, as well as with former, attempts at reformation. And we should do well to recollect that, though bound to thank God for all those, through whom the light of the Gospel shone more clearly, we always were regarded by them as a distinct and peculiar Church, and are not to identify ourselves with them."—*Ibid.* p. 194.

48. "Alexandria, the bulwark of the faith in the Holy Trinity, and North Africa, of the unmeritedness of God's free grace, a desolation ! Rome, once characterized for steady practical adherence to sound doctrine, a seat of Anti-Christ. Geneva, once proposed as the model of all reformed Churches, and of influence well nigh unbounded, and yet immediately the food of Socinianism, and now a prey to the heresy which came forth, but was for the time ejected, also from its bosom."—*Ibid.* p. 201.

49. "We can see how a person's whole views of Sanctification by the HOLY GHOST will be affected by Hoadly's low notions of the LORD'S Supper ; or how the error of Transubstantiation has modified other true doctrine, so as to cast into the shade the one oblation once offered upon the Cross ; or how the addition of the single practice of 'soliciting the saints to pray for men,' has in the Romish Church obscured the primary articles of Justification and of the Intercession of our Blessed LORD."—*Ibid.* 2nd Ed. p. 6.

50. "Having adopted the fiction of a letter from the Pope to certain members of your Church, as being his emissaries, it became necessary, by disguise, or omission, or perversion, to conceal whatever would have disturbed the unity of the drama. For instance, you play not unfrequently upon the words which one of these writers addresses to the Church of Rome—'Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses !' and who would not echo the wish . . . that she, as ourselves have been, might be restored to her primeval purity, when she was once the guardian of Christian truth ; that God would 'break the yoke of her burden, the staff on her shoulder, and the rod of her



oppressor?' Taken then in their obvious sense, the words are the expression of every Christian heart. Your fiction, however, required that they should express a desire for union with Rome AS SHE IS; and in this sense accordingly you quote them. The very next words of the writer contradict this. He proceeds (and to prevent the possibility of a mistake, he has printed these words in capitals): 'But, alas! AN UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE.' Honesty required the insertion of those words; but they would have spoiled the jest, and so they are omitted."—*Pusey's earnest Remonstrance to the author of the Pope's letter (vide Vol. iii. of the Tracts)*, p. 8.

51. "The ground taken by the Church of Rome is that all *her present* traditions are to be received, as of equal validity with the written word, because she holds them; our ground, that they are not to be so received, because they cannot be proved to be apostolic, and some are corrupt and vainly invented. Our controversy then with Rome is not an *à priori* question on the value of tradition in itself . . . but is one purely historical, that the Romanist traditions not being such, but on the contrary repugnant to Scripture, are not to be received. . . . Nor does our accepting the traditions of the *Universal Church in their day*, involve our accepting those of the particular Church of Rome, after so many centuries of corruption, *in the present*."—*Ibid.* p. 13.

52. "One not versed in history will be liable perpetually to confound the earlier truth, or unobjectionable custom, with the later corruption, especially if he has no very clear idea of Christian theology."—*Ibid.* p. 18.

53. "Now to this prayer (for the dead, in the first prayer-book,) neither Calvin nor Bucer objected that it was Papistical. On the contrary, Calvin says in his letter to the Protector, (Epp. p. 39. fol.) 'I hear that in the celebration of the Supper there is repeated a prayer for the departed, and I well know that this cannot be construed into an approbation of the Papistical Purgatory.' "—*Ibid.* p. 20.

54. "We never have, nor do we wish for any alteration in the liturgy of our Church; we bless God that our lot has fallen in her bosom,—that He has preserved in her the essentials of primitive doctrine and a liturgy so holy; and, although I cannot but think its first form preferable, alteration is out of the question: THERE CANNOT BE REAL ALTERATION WITHOUT A SCHISM; and as we claim to have our own consciences respected, so, even if we had the power of change, would we respect the consciences of others. . . . The whole course of the Tracts has, as you know, and yourself reproach us with, been against innovation."—*Ibid.* p. 28.

55. "You know that these authors had written also against Popery, and republished older writings against it: their very tracts are known by the name of 'Tracts against Popery and Dissent;' although, when they were commenced, dissent was everywhere a pressing evil, Popery had scarcely begun to bestir itself."—*Ibid.* p. 32.

56. "No one clergyman in or near Oxford has done any one thing as 'being justified by primitive antiquity;' but . . . whatever has



been done, has been done in obedience to the rubrics, or to carry them out into practice. . . . In no one church or chapel has any 'needless bowing' been introduced: clergymen, indeed, here always bow at the name of our Blessed LORD, wherever it occurs. . . . In the cathedral the dean and canons have from time immemorial, on leaving the choir, bowed to the altar. No cross has been added to the surplice; only one clergyman, who was at the time at Oxford, but not connected with any parish church, thinking this to be enjoined by the rubric prefixed to the Morning Prayers, 'wore in the train of his ministration such ornaments as were in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.' The scarf had then, it is said, two small black crosses, one at each end. . . . Whether the dress were that of Edward VI. I cannot say; it is enough for the principle that it was adopted as being sanctioned by the Church; and besides, one instance does not imply a system. Of 'unusual attitudes of devotion,' I know of none."—*Pusey's Letter to Townsend* (*British Mag.* vol. xii. p. 368.)

57. "Now let me first recapitulate what it is which has been thus blazoned about and exaggerated:—one clergyman has worn a cross on his scarf in compliance, as he thought, with our rubric; two clergymen have in new congregations knelt towards the East, in conformity with the ancient, and recent, and still-existing practice of our Church; two have used a table, where the rubric implies that the elements must be placed somewhere, but says not how. Strong party-spirit has taken up these reports, not for their own sake (else why do they pass unnoticed irregular innovations in the mode of administering the Communion or Baptism?) but because it was easier so to cast a slur upon a body of men, and, through them, upon sound principles, than to refute them."—*Ibid.* p. 642.

58. "From the time that the Church of Rome began to forsake the principles of the Church Catholic, and grasp after human means, she began also to take evil means for good ends, and incurring the apostolic curse on those who 'do evil that good may come,' took at last evil means for evil ends. She, the Apostolic Church of the West, consecrated by Apostolic blood, showed herself rather the descendant of them who slew the Apostles, and 'thought that they did God service,' stained herself with the blood of the saints, that on her might come all the righteous blood which was shed within her; even of the very Apostles, who had shed blood for her. There is not an enormity which has been practised against people or kings by miscreants in the name of God, but the divines of that unhappy Church have abetted or justified."—*Pusey's Sermon on the Fifth of November*, p. 29.

59. "The principle of the Romish Church was expediency; it was a plotting, scheming, worldly spirit, having at first God's glory for its end, but seeking it by secular means, and at last, in punishment, left to seek its own glory, and to set itself up in the place of God."—*Ibid.* p. 31.

60. "It is not, God knoweth, in any spirit of boast against these branches, some of which were grafted in before us, but still in encouragement and warning, that I would notice, that herein also our Church followed the principles of the Church Catholic, and with her had been portioned. She alone of all the reformed Churches was purified in the fire, and purged by the blood of martyrs, and had the evidence of affliction that she was a beloved child, and no bastard."—*Ibid.* p. 32.

---

#### EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF MR. NEWMAN.

61. "Various notions have led theological writers to implicate this celebrated Church [the Alexandrian] in the charge of heresy. . . . The Romanists have thought . . . to exalt the Apostolical purity of their own Church by the contrast of unfaithfulness in its early rival; and (what is of greater importance) to insinuate the necessity of an infallible authority, by exaggerating the errors and contrarieties of the ante-Nicene fathers, and the fact of its existence by throwing us upon the decisions of the later councils for the unequivocal statement of orthodox doctrine."—*Newman on Arianism*, p. 44.

62. "We agree with the Romanist in appealing to antiquity as our great teacher, but we deny that his doctrines are to be found in antiquity; and we maintain that his professed tradition is not really such, that it is a tradition of men, that it stops short of the Apostles, that the history of its introduction is known. On both accounts then his doctrines are innovations; because they run counter to the doctrine of antiquity, and because they rest upon what is historically an upstart tradition."—*Newman on Romanism*, p. 47, 48.

63. "How hopeless then is it to contend with Romanists, as if they practically agreed with us as to the foundation of faith, however much they pretend it! Ours is antiquity, theirs the existing Church. Its infallibility is their first principle; belief in it is a deep prejudice, quite beyond the reach of any thing external. It is quite clear that the combined testimonies of all the Fathers, supposing such a case, would not have a feather's weight against the decision of a Pope in Council."—*Ibid.* p. 86.

64. "We must take and deal with things as they are, not as they pretend to be. If we are induced to believe the professions of Rome, and make advances towards her as if a sister or a mother Church, which in theory she is, we shall find too late that we are in the arms of a pitiless and unnatural relation, who will but triumph in the arts which have inveigled us within her reach. No; dismissing the dreams which the romance of early Church history, and the high doctrines of Catholicism will raise in the inexperienced mind, let us be sure that she is our enemy, and will do us a mischief if she can. For in truth she is a Church beside herself, abounding in noble gifts and rightful titles, but unable to use them religiously; crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural, as madmen are, or rather, she may be

said to resemble a demoniac, . . . ruled within by an inexorable spirit."—*Ibid.* p. 102, 103.

65. "My next instance shall be the Roman doctrine of Purgatory. All Protestants are sufficiently alive to the seriousness of this error. Now I think it may be shown that its existence is owing to a like indulgence of human reason, and of private judgment upon Scripture, in default of Catholic tradition."—*Ibid.* p. 212.

66. "Whether we be right or wrong, our theory of religion has a meaning, and that really distinct from Romanism. They maintain that faith depends upon the Church; we, that the Church is built upon the faith. By Church Catholic we mean the Church Universal; they those branches of it which are in communion with Rome. Again, they understand by the faith, whatever the Church at any time declares to be faith; we, what it has actually so declared from the beginning. Both they and we anathematize those who deny the faith; but they extend the condemnation to all who question any decree of the Roman Church; we apply it to those only who deny any article of the original Apostolic creed."—*Ibid.* p. 259.

67. "The Thirty-nine Articles then are instruments of teaching, of Catholic teaching, being, as far as they go, heads, as it were, of important chapters in revealed truth. And it is as thus viewing them that we put them before the young. They are quite consistent with the prerogative accorded, as we have seen, by antiquity to the Apostolic Creed, quite distinct from the tyrannical enforcement of the Tridentine articles on the part of Rome."—*Ibid.* p. 290.

68. "This statement ('that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation,' Art. VI.) is very plain and clear except in one point, viz., who is to be the *judge* what is and what is not contained in Scripture. Our Church is silent on this point—very emphatically so. This is worth observing; in truth she does not admit, strictly speaking, of any judge at all, in the sense in which Romanists and Protestants contend for one; and in this point, as in others, holds a middle course between extreme theories. Romanism, as we all know, maintains the existence of a judge of controversies; nay, an infallible one, that is, the Church Catholic. Again the multitude of Protestants consider every man his own judge; they hold that every man may or must read Scripture for himself; and judge about its meaning, and make up his mind for himself. We neither hold that the Catholic Church is an infallible judge of Scripture, nor that each individual may judge for himself; but that the Church has *authority*, and that individuals may judge for themselves outside the range of that authority. The Church is not a *judge* of the sense of Scripture in the common sense of the word, but a *witness*—a keeper and witness of Catholic tradition. She bears witness to a fact that such and such a doctrine, or such a sense of Scripture, has ever been received, and came from the Apostles."—*Ibid.* p. 327, *et seq.*

69. "Nor let any one be startled at all this discordance of opinion among our divines, in their mode of proving one of the



great principles of Protestantism [Scripture the rule of faith], as if it reflected upon the wisdom or soundness of the principle itself. Above all, let not Romanists venture to take advantage of it, lest we retort upon them the vacillations, absurdities, intrigues, and jealousies displayed in the deliberations of divines attendant on their general councils."—*Ibid.* p. 346.

70. "If this line of argument can be maintained, there will be this especial force in it as addressed to Romanists. They are accustomed to taunt us with inconsistency, as if we used the tradition of the Church only when and as far as we could not avoid it. . . . We do *not* discard the tradition of the Fathers; we accept it; we accept it entirely; we accept its witness concerning itself and against itself. It witnesses to its own inferiority to Scripture."—*Ibid.* p. 349.

71. "Nothing I think is plainer from these extracts [some quoted from the Fathers] than that the authors of them looked upon Scripture as the public standard of proof, the tribunal of appeal in controversy."—*Ibid.* p. 399.

72. "Time went on, and he [Satan] devised a second idol of the true CHRIST, and it remained in the Temple of GOD for many a year. The age was rude and fierce. Satan took the darker side of the Gospel. . . . The religion of the world was then a fearful religion. Superstitions abounded, and cruelties. The noble firmness, the graceful austerity of the true Christian, were superseded by forbidding spectres, harsh of eye and haughty of brow; and these were the patterns or the tyrants of a beguiled people."—*Newman's Sermons*, vol. i. p. 359.

73. "Satan could not hinder, he could but corrupt the kingdom promised to the saints. He could but seduce them to trust in an arm of flesh. He could but sow the seeds of decay among them by alluring them to bow down to 'Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians, and Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites,' and to make a king over them like the nations, 'when the LORD was their king.' Had it not been for this falling away in divers times and places, surely Christendom would not be in its present miserable state of disunion and weakness."—*Newman's Sermons*, vol. ii. p. 282.

74. "There have been ages of the world, in which men have thought too much of angels, and paid them excessive honour; honoured them so perversely as to forget the supreme worship due to Almighty God. This is the sin of a dark age."—*Ibid.* p. 400.

75. "It is too evident how grievously the church of Rome has erred in this part of Christian duty [zeal]. Let her doctrines be as pure as her defenders maintain, still she has undisputably made the church an instrument of worldly politics by a 'zeal not according to knowledge.' Let us grant that her doctrine was not fatally corrupted till the sixteenth century; nevertheless, from the eleventh at least she has made CHRIST'S kingdom of this world. I will not in-



quire whether she committed the additional most miserable sin of rebellion against Cæsar ; though from what we see around us at this day there is great reason to fear that from the beginning of her power she has been tainted with it."—*Ibid.* p. 436.

76. "He will but observe that, if Popery be a perversion or corruption of the truth, as we believe, it must, by the mere force of the terms, be like that truth which it counterfeits ; and, therefore, the fact of a resemblance, as far as it is borne out, is no proof of any essential approximation in his opinions to Popery as such. Rather, it would be a serious argument against their primitive character, if to superficial observers they bore no likeness to it. Ultra-Protestantism could never have been silently corrupted into Popery."—*Ibid.* vol. iii. *Advertisement.*

77. "A great part of the Christian world, as is well known, believes that after this life the souls of Christians ordinarily go into a prison called Purgatory, where they are kept in fire or other torment, till, their sins being burned away, they are at length fitted for that glorious kingdom into which nothing defiled can enter. Now, if there were any good reason for this belief, we should certainly have a very sad and depressing prospect before us. . . . But, in fact, CHRIST has mercifully interposed expressly to assure us that our friends are better provided for than this doctrine would make it appear. He assures us that they 'rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.' "—*Ibid.* p. 408.

78. "It is 'JESUS CHRIST, before our eyes evidently set forth, crucified among us.' Not before our bodily eyes ; so far, every thing remains at the end of that heavenly communion as it did at the beginning. What was bread remains bread, and what was wine remains wine. We need no carnal, earthly, visible miracle to convince us of the presence of the LORD incarnate."—*Ibid.* vol. iv. p. 167.

79. "While we think thus of the invisible Church, we are restrained by many reasons from such invocations of her separate members as are unhappily so common in other Christian countries. First, because the practice was not primitive, but an addition, which the world had poured into the Church ; next, because we are told to pray to GOD only, and invocation may easily be corrupted into prayer, and then becomes idolatrous. And further, it must be considered that though the Church is represented in Scripture as a channel of GOD's gifts to us, yet it is only as a body, and sacramentally, not as an agent, nor in her members one by one. St. Paul does not say that we are brought near to this saint or that saint, but to all together ; to the spirits of just men made perfect."—*Ibid.* p. 207.

80. "Hence the charge, not unfounded as regards Romanism, that it views, or tends to view, the influences of grace, not as the operations of a living GOD, but as a something to bargain about, and buy, and traffic with, as if religion were, not an approach to things above us, but a commerce with our equals concerning things we can master."—*Newman on Justification*, p. 316.

81. "The view of justification taken by Romanists and by a school of divines among ourselves, tends to fix the mind on self, not on CHRIST; whereas that which I have advocated as Scriptural and Catholic, buries itself in the vision of a present, an in-dwelling God."—*Ibid.* p. 220.

82. "So much space has been given to Bucer's doctrine, because he is in a small degree connected with our own Reformation; and such as his has been the current doctrine of the English Church. Our divines, though of very different schools, have, with few exceptions, agreed in this, that justification is gained by obedience in the shape of faith; that is an obedience which confesses it is not sufficient, and trusts solely in Christ's merits for acceptance—not the Roman, that the obedience justifies without a continual imputation of Christ's merits; nor the Protestant, that the imputation justifies distinct from obedience."—*Ibid.* p. 420.

83. "The Council of Trent did, as regards Roman errors, what, for all we know, though God forbid, some future Synod of the English Church may do as regards Protestant errors, take them into her system, make them forms of communion, bind upon her hitherto favoured sons their grievous chain; and what that unhappy Council actually did for Rome, that does every one in his place and according to his power, who by declaiming against and denouncing those who dare to treat the Protestant errors as unestablished, gives a helping hand towards their establishment."—*Newman's Letter to Faussett*, p. 15.

84. "Who defends such things as these [worship of the Blessed Virgin]? who says the Church of Rome was free from them before Trent? . . . Why are the Tracts to be censured for stating a plain historical fact, that the Roman Church did not, till Trent, embody in her creed the mass of her present tenets, while they do not deny but expressly acknowledge her great corruptions before that era; while they give the history of Transubstantiation prior to Trent, (Nos. 27, 28.) of the breviary worship of the Blessed Virgin prior to Trent, (No. 79.) while they formally draw up points in which they feel agreement with Romanism to be hopeless, (Nos. 38. 71.) and while they declare, (in large letters to draw attention) that, while Rome is what it is, 'union' with it 'is impossible' (No. 20.)? All that can be said against them is, that in discussing the Roman tenets, they use guarded language; and this I will say, that the more we have personal experience of the arduous controversy in question, the more shall we understand the absolute necessity, if we are to make any way, of weighing our words and keeping from declamation."—*Ibid.* p. 18.

85. "It is idolatry to bow down to any emblem or symbol as divine which God Himself has not appointed; and since He has not appointed the worship of images, such worship is idolatrous. . . . It is impossible for any religious man, *having* a crucifix, not to treat it with reverence . . . but . . . I more than doubt whether a crucifix, carved to represent life, as such memorials commonly are, be not

too true to be reverent, and too distressing for familiar contemplation. . . . So much I know, that the use of the crucifix is in this place no badge of persons whose mode of thinking you would condemn. How many crucifixes could be counted up in Oxford I know not; but you will find them in the possession of those who are no special friends or followers of Mr. Froude, and perhaps cordial admirers, except of course on this one point, of the tenor of your publication."—*Ibid.* p. 25. *In a Note*—"I know or have heard of the names of four persons altogether; one of the four I have forgotten, and another I cannot be sure I heard."

86. "O that we had the courage and the generous faith to aim at perfection, to demand the attention, to claim the submission of the world! Thousands of hungry souls in all classes of life stand around us; we do not give them what they want, the image of a true Christian people, living in that Apostolic awe and strictness which carries with it an evidence that they are the Church of CHRIST. This is the way to withstand and repel the Romanists; not by cries of alarm, and rumour of plots, and disputes, and denunciations, but by living up to the Creeds, the Services, the Ordinances, the usages of *our own* Church, without fear of consequences, without fear of being called Papists: to let matters take their course freely, and to trust to God's good Providence for the issue."—*Ibid.* p. 98.

---

#### EXTRACTS FROM FROUDE'S REMAINS.

87. "The Romanists [are not schismatics in England and Catholics abroad, but they] are wretched Tridentines every where."—*Froude's Remains*, vol. i. p. 434.

88. "I never could be a Romanist; I never could think all those things in Pope Pius' Creed necessary to salvation."—*Ibid.*

89. "We found to our horror, that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church made the acts of each successive Council obligatory for ever; that what had been once decided could not be meddled with again: in fact, that they were committed finally and irrevocably, and could not advance one step to meet us, even though the Church of England should again become what it was in Laud's time, or indeed what it may have been up to the atrocious Council [of Trent]; for M.— admitted that many things, *e. g.* the doctrine of mass, which were fixed then, had been indeterminate before. So much for the Council of Trent, for which Christendom has to thank Luther and the Reformers. . . . I own it has altogether changed my notions of the Roman Catholics, and made me wish for a total overthrow of their system."—*Ibid.* pp. 307, 308.

90. "I remember you told me that I should come back a better Englishman than I went away; better satisfied not only that our Church is nearest in theory right, but also that practically, in spite of its abuses, it works better; and, to own the truth, your prophecy is already nearly realized. Certainly I have as yet only seen the surface of things; but what I have seen does not come up to my



notions of propriety. These Catholic countries seem in an especial manner κατέχειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ ["to hold the truth in unrighteousness."] And the priesthood are themselves so sensible of the hollow basis upon which their power rests, that they dare not resist the most atrocious encroachments of the State upon their privileges. . . I have seen priests laughing when at the Confessional; and indeed it is plain that unless they habitually made light of very gross immorality, three-fourths of the population [of Naples] would be excommunicated. . . . The Church of England has fallen low, and will probably be worse before it is better; but let the Whigs do their worst, they cannot sink us so deep as these people have allowed themselves to fall while retaining all the superficials of a religious country."—*Ibid.* p. 293, 294.

91. "Since I have been out here, I have got a worse notion of the Roman Catholics than I had. I really do think them idolaters, though I cannot be quite confident of my information as it affects the character of the priests. . . . What I mean by calling these people idolaters is, that I believe they look upon the Saints and Virgin as good-natured people that will try to get them let off easier than the Bible declares, and that, as they don't intend to comply with the conditions on which God promises to answer prayers, they pray to them as a come-off. But this is a generalization for which I have not sufficient data."—*Ibid. vide Preface*, p. xiii.

---

#### EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF MR. KEBLE.

92. "The deep and sincere dread with which Hooker regarded the errors and aggressions of Rome is apparent in every part of his writings; and so much the more instructive will it prove, should we find him of his own accord embracing those Catholic opinions and practices, which some in their zeal for popery may have too lightly parted with, but which, as Rome alone could not give them, so neither should we allow her indirectly to take them away."—*From the Preface to Hooker.* p. iv.

93. "King James II. it is well known, ascribed to Hooker, more than to any other writer, his own ill-starred conversion to Romanism: against which, nevertheless, if he had thought a little more impartially, he might have perceived that Hooker's works every where inculcate that which is the only sufficient antidote, respect for the true Church of the Fathers, as subsidiary to Scripture and a witness of its true meaning."—*Ibid.* p. cv.

94. "The Freedom of the Anglican Church may be vindicated against the exorbitant claims of Rome, and yet no disparagement ensue of the authority inherent in the Catholic Apostolical Church."—*From the Sermon on Primitive Tradition*, p. 6.

95. "We are naturally, if not reasonably, jealous of the word Tradition, associated as it is in our minds with the undue claims and pernicious errors of Rome."—*Ibid.* p. 20.

96. "The genuine Canons of the Primitive Councils, and the



genuine fragments of the Primitive Liturgies, are reducible into a small space; even although we go so low down in both as the division of the Eastern and Western Churches, including the six first councils general, and excluding image-worship, and similar corruptions by authority."—*Ibid.* p. 40.

97. "The reverence of the Latin Church for tradition, being applied unscrupulously, and without the necessary check from Scripture, to opinions and practices of a date comparatively recent, has led a large portion of Christendom to disuse and contempt, not of Scripture only, but of that real and sure tradition, which they ought to have religiously depended upon."—*Ibid.* p. 45.

98. "Had this rule (the exclusion of novelty,) been faithfully kept, it would have preserved the Church just as effectually from Transubstantiation on the one hand, as from the denial of Christ's real Presence on the other hand. The two errors in the original are but Rationalism in different forms;—endeavours to explain away, and bring nearer to the human intellect, that which had been left thoroughly mysterious both by Scripture and Tradition."—*Ibid.* p. 47.

99. "Many men . . have argued against an imaginary case, instead of addressing themselves to the realities of Church History; and have thus given an advantage to Romanists on one side, and Rationalists on the other, of which neither party has been slow to avail itself. Such is not the way of the English Church; she does not so violently sever the different parts of the constitution of the Kingdom of Heaven; but acknowledging Scripture as her written charter, and Tradition as the common law whereby both the validity and practical meaning of that charter is ascertained, venerates both as inseparable members of one great providential system: without confounding their provinces, or opposing them to each other, in the manner of modern Rome. Why should it be thought a thing incredible, that persons should be found among her members and ministers, desirous to follow, as God shall give them grace, in so plain, so reasonable, so moderate, so safe a way? Because they call attention to the fact, that "*Primitive Tradition is recognized in Holy Scripture*," as being, *AT THAT TIME*, of paramount authority; why should they be presently suspected of having a system of their own in reserve,—a theory, like some parts of Romanism, *still* independent of Holy Scripture, and to be supported by *modern traditions*?"—*Ibid.* p. 74.

100. "Because the Romanists make bold with the word Tradition on very different matters from this—mere instructions of a part of the present Church, in no wise able to stand the test of Vincentius, even supposing them uncontradicted in Scripture:—are we therefore to throw aside or depreciate a Tradition, established as we see the Nicene Creed is?"—*Ibid.* p. 147.

101. "Of course, if so it had pleased Almighty God, the Scriptures might have been all clear of themselves; or their meaning might have been clearly revealed to individuals, at a certain stage of their progress in the Christian life; or there might be somewhere in the present Church an unerring court of appeal to fix their interpretation.

Men may go on imagining the advantages of such a dispensation, until they have persuaded themselves that things are really so ordered. But theories of that kind, after all that can be said in their favour, must they not incur the censure of true wisdom, as partaking of "that idle and not very innocent employment of forming imaginary models of a new world, and schemes of governing it?" How much better, humbly to acquiesce in God's dispensations as we find them! How much more dutiful, with all seriousness to use our privilege of belonging to a Church, which, on the one hand, refers us to Scripture as the standard and treasure of all necessary doctrine, on the other hand, "ties her doctors, as much as the Council of Trent does, to expound Scripture according to the consent of the ancient Fathers <sup>1</sup>."—*Ibid.* p. 149.

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Taylor's Works, x. 322.

## INDEX.

- Additions, Roman, 21. 62  
 Anathemas, 10. 22. 83  
 Angel worship, 36. 74  
 Anglo-Catholics, contented, 24. 44<sup>b</sup>. 54.  
     101; not innovators in discipline, 56.  
     57; highly-favoured in their Reformation, 45; persecuted, 9. 45. 60; opposed to Romanism, 5. 6. 55. 93; successful in opposition, 86; always accounted Papistical by those who went further, 44<sup>b</sup>  
 Catholic doctrine and practices not derived from Rome, 92  
 Confession, forced, 14. 22  
 Corruptions, Roman, 6. 12. 13. 15. 16. 18. 20. 23. 26. 29. 31. 32. 38. 42. 43. 51. 52. 73. 75. 76  
 Corrupt state of Italian Churches, 90  
 Council of Trent, 23. 67. 83. 87. 89  
 Councils, General, 69  
 Dark ages, 26. 72. 74  
 Denial of Cup, 14. 22  
 Fathers subsidiary to Scripture, 93  
 Idolaters, Italian Romanists, 91  
 Idolatry, 85  
 Image worship, 14. 22  
 Indulgences, 14  
 Infallibility, 12. 61. 63. 68. 89. 101  
 Intention in Sacraments, 22  
 Invocation of Saints, 14. 22. 27. 37. 49. 79  
 Justification, 14. 81. 82  
 Legends, 27  
 Masses, usage of, 14. 25. 33  
 Mediators, human, 39  
 Merits, 14. 34. 80  
 Penance, 25. 34. 44  
 Perversions, Roman, 23. 25. 46. 76  
 Popery, incurable, 7; a falling off, 73; pestilential, 7; malicious and cruel, 15. 64; rebellious, 75; tyrannical, 1. 67. 72; an insanity, 64; an evil spirit, *ibid.*; heretical, 3. 7. 8. 20; exclusive, 19; an apology for Luther, 4; caused by Luther, 89; irreconcilably different from us, 7. 14. 28. 50. 66. 84. 88; unscriptural, 6; presumptuous, 17; persecuting, 9. 32. 58; political, 58. 59. 75; rationalizes, 98; an Antichrist, 38. 40. 41. 48. 72  
 Prayer for the dead in Christ, 53  
 Purgatory, 14. 22. 29. 31. 65. 77  
 Rome, its strength, 8; a demoniac, 64; its claims exorbitant, 94  
 Saint worship, 30. 36. 84  
 Scripture, 70. 71  
 Supremacy, Roman, 2. 12. 14  
 Superstitions, Roman, 1. 72  
 Traditions, 25. 51. 62. 70. 95. 96. 97. 99. 100  
 Transubstantiation, 10. 11. 14. 25. 31. 33. 35. 49. 78. 84. 98  
 Unknown tongue, Service in, 14











BINDING 3.

SEP 7 1967

BX  
5131  
P8  
1839

Pusey, Edward Bouverie  
A letter to Richard  
2d ed.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

---

